DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 446 EA 030 357

TITLE	Individual Programs: 1999 Performance Reports and 2001 Plans. Volume 2. U.S. Department of Education.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of the Under Secretary.
PUB DATE	2000-03-00
NOTE	845p.; For volume 1, see EA 030 356.
AVAILABLE FROM	ED Pubs, P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794-1398. Tel: 877-433-7827 (Toll Free). For full text: http://www.ed.gov/pubs.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF05/PC34 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; Annual Reports; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; *Organizational Objectives; *Performance Factors; *Program Descriptions; Quality Control
IDENTIFIERS	*Department of Education

ABSTRACT

This report provides an overview of the Department of Education's (ED) progress toward four main goals: (1) help all children reach challenging academic standards so they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment; (2) build a solid foundation for learning for all children; (3) ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning; and (4) make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction. The report was created to meet the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act. The volume contains information on education reform and is divided into 16 sections. These sections cover the following topics: education reform; education for disadvantaged children; impact aid; school-improvement programs; reading excellence programs; Indian education; school-renovation programs; bilingual and immigrant education; special education; rehabilitation services and special institutions; student financial assistance; vocational and adult education; higher education; education research, statistics, and improvement; Office for Civil Rights; and Office of the Inspector General. Some of the programs that are discussed include school-to-work opportunities, migrant education, teaching to high standards, state grants, the foreign-language assistance program, state grants for incarcerated youth, the underground railroad program, the National Writing Project, civic education, and the fund for the improvement of education. (RJM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 446

EA

U.S. Department of Education Volume 2

Individual Programs

1999 Performance Reports and 2001 Plans

EA 030357

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

March 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education

Volume 2

Individual Programs

1999 Performance Reports and 2001 Plans

Office of the Under Secretary
Planning and Evaluation Service

U.S. Department of Education
Richard W. Riley
Secretary

Frank S. Holleman, III
Deputy Secretary

Planning and Evaluation Service
Alan L. Ginsburg
Director

Lois Peak
Bob LeGrand
Team Leaders

March 2000

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce in whole or in part is granted, and permission to reprint this publication is not necessary. If citing the report, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Planning and Evaluation Service. *U.S. Department of Education Volume II—Individual Programs: 1999 Performance Reports and 2001 Plans*, March 2000. Washington D.C.: Author.

Copies of this report are available at no charge by contacting the Education Publications Center, U.S. Department of Education (EDPubs) at 1-877-433-7827 (toll free), or on the World Wide Web at www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html. Electronic files can be downloaded from the Department of Education's Web site at www.ed.gov/pubs/.

On request, this publication is available in alternative formats, such as Braille, large print, audio tape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at (202) 260-9895 or (202) 205-8113. TTY/TDD is available by calling 1-877-576-7734.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE PLANS

EDUCATION REFORM

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS A-3
SMALL, SAFE, AND SUCCESSFUL HIGH SCHOOLS A-8
TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE PROGRAMS: TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND, TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION CHALLENGE GRANTS, AND NATIONAL ACTIVITIES A-9
NEXT GENERATION TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION A-19
STAR SCHOOLS PROGRAM A-21
REGIONAL TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION CONSORTIA (R*TECS) A-23
READY-TO-LEARN TELEVISION A-26
TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT A-29
TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR MATHEMATICS A-31
PREPARING TOMORROW'S TEACHERS TO USE TECHNOLOGY A-33
RECOGNITION AND REWARD A-40
GOALS 2000 STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT A-42
SCHOOL-TO-WORK OPPORTUNITIES A-47

EDUCATION FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

TITLE I GRANTS FOR SCHOOLS SERVING AT-RISK CHILDREN B-3
EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAM B-15
MIGRANT EDUCATION B-21
PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N OR D) B-26
DEMONSTRATIONS OF COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM B-29
HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM AND COLLEGE ASSISTANCE MIGRANT PROGRAM B-34

IMPACT AID

IMPACT AID C-3

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Innovative Education Program Strategies D-3
Class-Size Reduction Program D-5
Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program—State Grants Program and National Programs D-9
Inexpensive Book Distribution D-16
Arts Education D-18
Magnet Schools Assistance Program D-20
Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Program D-23
Women's Educational Equity Assistance (WEEA) D-26
Training and Advisory Services (Title IV of the Civil Rights Act: Equity Assistance Centers Program) D-29
Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program D-31
Native Hawaiian Education Program D-34
Alaska Native Education Program D-37
Public Charter Schools Program D-40
Opportunities to Improve Our Nation's Schools Program (Options) D-45
Advanced Placement Test Incentive D-47
Strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity D-49
- Comprehensive Centers Program D-51
- Strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity Grants D-55

Teaching to High Standards State Grants D-57
- Eisenhower Professional Development Program D-59
- Teaching to High Standards State Grants D-67

School Leadership Initiative D-71
National Activities for the Improvement of Teaching and School Leadership D-73
- Eisenhower Federal Activities D-75

Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia D-78
Teacher Quality Initiatives D-81
Transition to Teaching: Troops to Teachers D-83
Early Childhood Educator Professional Development D-85

READING EXCELLENCE PROGRAM

Reading Excellence Program E-3

INDIAN EDUCATION

Indian Education F-3

SCHOOL RENOVATION PROGRAM

School Renovation Program G-3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

Bilingual Education Instructional Services Program H-3
Foreign Language Assistance Program H-10
Emergency Immigrant Education Program H-12

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Grants to States and Preschool Grants Programs—IDEA Part B I-3
Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities—IDEA Part C I-10
National Activities—IDEA Part D I-15

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

State Vocational Rehabilitation Services (Including Supported Employment) J-3
American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services J-9
Client Assistance Program (CAP) J-12
Training Program J-15
Demonstration and Training Programs J-18
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program J-21
Recreational Program J-24
Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) J-26
Projects With Industry (PWI) J-29
Independent Living Programs J-32
Program Improvement J-37
Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults J-39
National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) J-43
Assistive Technology Program J-47
American Printing House for the Blind J-51
National Technical Institute for the Deaf J-54
Gallaudet University J-59

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Student Financial Assistance Policy K-3
Student Financial Assistance Programs K-10

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Perkins Vocational and Technology Education (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators) L-3
National Programs (Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act) L-9
Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions L-13
Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development L-15
State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders L-22
National Institute for Literacy L-25

HIGHER EDUCATION

Aid for Institutional Development, Titles III and V M-3
Dual Degree Programs for Minority-Serving Institutions M-7
International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program M-9
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education M-12
Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education M-16
Annual Interest Subsidy Grants M-19
TRIO Programs M-21
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (Gear Up) M-25
Byrd Honors Scholarships Program M-28
Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) and Javits Fellowships M-30
Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program M-33
Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships M-35
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants M-39
Underground Railroad Program M-46
GPRA Data/Evaluation Program M-48
Howard University M-50

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistics and Assessment N-3
Research, Development and Dissemination N-9
- National Education Research Institutes N-11
- Regional Educational Laboratories N-16
- Dissemination N-19

Fund for the Improvement of Education N-23
Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education N-26
National Writing Project (NWP) N-29
Civic Education N-32
International Education Exchange Program N-35

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Office for Civil Rights O-3

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Office of the Inspector General (OIG) P-3

EDUCATION REFORM

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS

Goal: To enable public elementary and secondary schools to plan, implement, or expand extended learning opportunities for the benefit of the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of their communities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 1.5 (families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts) by turning schools into Community Learning Centers. Also supports Objective 1.3 by supporting extended learning programs based in schools, such as after-school or summer-school hours; and supports Objectives 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 by providing academic support and enrichment in core subject areas including reading and mathematics to help students meet or exceed state and local standards.

FY 2000—$453,377,000

FY 2001—$1,000,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PARTICIPANTS IN 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER PROGRAMS WILL DEMONSTRATE EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL BENEFITS AND EXHIBIT POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL CHANGES.

Indicator 1.1 Achievement: Students regularly participating in the program will show continuous improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades, and/or teacher reports.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of students with 1999 teacher-reported changes in student homework completion and class participation (second cohort of grantees)

Actual Performance	Elementary	Middle or High School	Both	Total
Increased	75%	50%	35%	41%
Decreased	1%	18%	6%	10%
Stayed Same	24%	32%	59%	49%

Performance Targets

1999:	**No target set**
2000:	Baseline data established
2001:	Target will be set

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge until further data are available.

Explanation: According to 1999 teacher reports, 75 percent of the students participating in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs at the elementary school level showed improvement in homework completion and class participation. The percentages for students in programs serving middle or high schools and those serving students at both the elementary and middle/high school levels are 50 percent and 35 percent, respectively. The comparatively lower proportion of increases at the non-elementary level is partially attributable to the age group serviced and the relatively less intensive services received at the middle and high school levels.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Grantee performance reports.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by **second round** grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from a subset (22 percent) of second-round grantees who voluntarily followed a standardized reporting form. "Regular attendees" are defined as students who have attended the program a minimum of 10 days. However, the data in this report are not limited to regularly attending participants. The activities reported and the use of teacher reports are an imprecise estimate of student achievement. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format. Also, data from grantee reports will be compared with the evaluation results for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

Indicator 1.2 Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvements on measures such as school attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of students with 1999 teacher-reported changes in student behavior (second cohort of grantees)

Actual Performance	Elementary	Middle or High School	Both	Total
Increase	70%	57%	38%	45%
Decrease	1%	5%	7%	6%
Stayed Same	29%	38%	55%	49%

Performance Targets

1999:	**No target set**
2000:	Baseline data established
2001:	Target will be set

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge until further data are available.

Explanation: According to 1999 teacher reports, 70 percent of the students participating in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs at the elementary school level showed behavioral improvements. The percentages for students in programs serving middle or high schools and those serving students at both levels are 57 percent and 38 percent respectively. The lower proportion of increases at the non-elementary level is partially attributable differences in age and the relatively less intensive services received at the middle and high school levels.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Grantee reports; planned external evaluation.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from a subset (22 percent) of second-round grantees who voluntarily followed a standardized reporting form. In addition, teacher reports are subjective and thus subject to variation over time and across sites. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format.

OBJECTIVE 2: 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS WILL OFFER A RANGE OF HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATIONAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES.

Indicator 2.1 Core educational services: More than 85 percent of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area (second cohort of grantees)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999:	**82%**	**85% or higher**
2000:		85% or higher
2001:		85% or higher

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target not met, but future progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: A substantial proportion of the grantees (82 percent) offers at least one core academic service (e.g., supplementary help in reading, mathematics, or science).

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Grantee performance reports.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from a subset (49 percent) of second-round grantees. Also, current data do not reflect quality, only whether the service is offered. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format and will include objective measures of service quality.

Indicator 2.2 Enrichment and support activities: More than 85 percent of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology (second cohort of grantees)			**Status:** Target exceeded. **Explanation:** The vast majority of the centers (93 percent) offer enrichment and support services with a significant proportion (58 percent) offering computer- or technology-related activities.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are based on reports from the second cohort. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**58%**	**85% or higher**		
2000:		85% or higher		
2001:		85% or higher		
Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas (second cohort of grantees)				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**93%**	**85% or higher**		
2000:		85% or higher		
2001:		85% or higher		

Indicator 2.3 Community involvement: Centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average number of community partners reported (second cohort of grantees)			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The average number of community partners (5) is a proxy measure of community involvement. More accurately assessing the depth of involvement will be a goal for future data collection.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are based on reports from the second cohort. The quality of partnership activities is not reported by grantees and is difficult to measure. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format. The national impact evaluation will collect more detailed information on the quality of collaboration.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**5**	**No target set**		
2000:		Baseline data established		
2001:		Target will be set		

Indicator 2.4 Services to parents and other adult community members: More than 85 percent of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering services to parents and other adult community members			**Status:** Target not met. **Explanation:** Approximately half (51 percent) of the grantees offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members. The Department intends to emphasize this aspect of the program in the future.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**51%**	**85% or higher**		
2000:		85% or higher		
2001:		85% or higher		

Indicator 2.4 Services to parents and other adult community members: More than 85 percent of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members (continued).

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from the second cohort. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format.

Indicator 2.5 Extended hours: More than 75 percent of centers will offer services at least 15 hours a week on average and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering 15 or more hours per week during the school year in 1999 (second cohort of grantees):	**Status:** Target not met. **Explanation:** The percentages of centers offering extended hours during the school year and the summer sessions are 62 percent and 90 percent, respectively. The Department intends to emphasize this aspect of the program in the future.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are based on reports from the second cohort. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999:	**62%**	**75% or higher**
2000:		75% or higher
2001:		75% or higher

Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering 15 or more hours per week during the summer in 1999 (second cohort of grantees):

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999:	**90%**	**75% or higher**
2000:		75% or higher
2001:		75% or higher

OBJECTIVE 3: 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS WILL SERVE CHILDREN AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS WITH THE GREATEST NEEDS FOR EXPANDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES.

Indicator 3.1 High-need communities: More than 80 percent of Centers are located in high-poverty communities.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of 21st Century Centers located in schools with at least 35 percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (second cohort of grantees):	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** 80 percent of the grantees are in schools in which more than 35 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. However, the school lunch measure is only a proxy for community poverty status. Census/Common Core Data will be used in the future to provide data for this indicator.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are based on reports from the second cohort. Eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch is not a reliable measure for community poverty. Beginning in 2000, ED will use Census/Common Core Data to measure community poverty levels.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1999:	**80%**	**80% or higher**
FY 2000:		80% or higher
FY 2001:		80% or higher

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Establish absolute priority for programs that offer extended learning opportunities.
- Establish competitive preference for programs that help students meet or exceed state and local standards in core subjects such as reading, mathematics, or science.
- In partnership with national foundations, develop training and technical assistance opportunities for grantees to ensure the quality of implemented programs.
- Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to center leadership and staff.
- Create grantee advisory groups and listservs to facilitate exchange of best practices and materials.
- Establish priorities for programs that serve economically distressed rural and urban communities.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- In partnership with national foundations, develop training and technical assistance opportunities for grantees to foster sustainability of implemented programs.
- Create grantee searchable database on the Web for public access to detailed information regarding local programs and to assist local areas plan their own after-school programs and applications for this grant.
- In partnership with national foundations, provide national task forces on special topics such as evaluation, equity of access, and promising practices.
- In partnership with national foundations, expanded grant application workshop opportunities for potential applicants in all the states and territories.
- Establish competitive grants, giving priority to applications from Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvements" status.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Through collaboration with other Federal offices, shares information with applicants and grantees on programs such as America Reads (ED), Gear Up (ED), Safe and Drug-Free Schools (ED), AmeriCorps (CNS), Child Care Development Block Grants (HHS), and the National School Lunch Program (USDA).
- As part of the Federal Support to Communities initiative, housed by Vice President Gore's National Partnership for Reinventing Government, coordinates its resources and efforts with 14 federal agencies to create and maintain a Web site (http://www.afterschool.gov) and other outreach efforts.
- In partnership with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, co-chairs a coordination task force to better serve citizens through our federal programs that support after-school.
- In coordination with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, actively promotes local awareness and access to the USDA federal funds for after-school snacks and meals through their various funding programs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Community needs across the country vary in nature and in gaps in services.
- There are many influences on student achievement and behavior outside the impact of afterschool services to students. Given these other influences, it is difficult to indicate exact changes in student achievement and behavior due to these programs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None

Dropped—None

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was adjusted to include test score data where available.
- Indicator 1.3 was adjusted to focus on behavior measures, moving test scores to indicator 1.1 and dropping a measure of challenging coursework.
- Indicator 2.5 was formerly indicator 2.3. The data element was changed to 15 hours per week from 3 hours per day for 5 days, as this is a more standardized number for collection.
- Indicator 3.1 was adjusted to reflect community need instead of student need.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.3 was dropped.
- Indicator 1.4 was dropped because teacher reports could be included as sources of data for indicators 1.1 and 1.2.
- Indicator 2.4 was dropped.
- Indicator 3.2 was dropped because the new indicator 3.1 addresses the entire community need, not just elementary, middle or high school students.

New

- Indicator 2.3 was added to address the importance of collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining these programs.
- Indicator 2.4 was added to address services to adults in the community instead of program retention as students move frequently from school to school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SMALL, SAFE, AND SUCCESSFUL HIGH SCHOOLS

Goal: To assist high schools to create smaller learning communities that can prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: To be determined.
FY 2001—$120,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN CORE SUBJECTS WILL SHOW MARKED IMPROVEMENT IN SCHOOLS RECEIVING SMALL, SAFE, AND SUCCESSFUL HIGH SCHOOL FUNDS.

Indicator 1.1 Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Small, Safe, and Successful High School grants will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels of performance on state and local assessments.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation (to begin in 2000).
FY 1999:	**Not Applicable**	**Not Applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Not Applicable	**Explanation:** New program. Initial grants to be awarded in summer 2000.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Baseline to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

KEY STRATEGIES

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To be determined.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To be established.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.
Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.
Dropped—None.
New—None.

TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE PROGRAMS: TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND, TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION CHALLENGE GRANTS, AND NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Goal: To use educational technology as part of broader education reform that will provide new learning opportunities and raise educational achievement for all students.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, Technology Innovation Challenge Grants, and National Activities support Objective 1.7 (schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education) by providing funds to increase school and student access to educational technology and promote the development of models of effective practice in integrating educational technology into teaching and learning).

FY 2000—$605,755,000 (Excluding Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology)

FY 2001—$552,000,000 (Requested budget for Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Leadership Activities and Community Technology Centers)

FY 2000—$100,000,000 (Requested budget for Community Technology Centers)

FY 2001—Technology Innovation Challenge Grants is proposed for consolidation with Star Schools under Next Generation Technology Innovation, for which $170,000,000 is requested.

OBJECTIVE 1: STUDENTS IN HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOLS WILL HAVE ACCESS TO EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY THAT IS COMPARABLE TO THE ACCESS HAD BY STUDENTS IN OTHER SCHOOLS.

Indicator 1.1 Computer access in high-poverty schools: The student-to-computer ratio in high-poverty schools will be comparable to that in other schools.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Students to computer ratio				**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms: 1994-99, February 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* February 2001 for fall 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Internet access is one measure of the multimedia capacity of computers. Student to computer ratios are decreasing toward the goal of one computer for every five students. However, student to computer ratios are decreasing at a slower rate in high-poverty schools than low-poverty schools.	**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.
	Low-Poverty Schools	**High-Poverty Schools**	**High-Poverty Schools**	The band used to define "high-poverty schools" consists of schools in which 71 percent of students or more are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch; the band used to define "low-poverty schools" consists of schools in which less than 11 percent of students are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Poverty measures are based on data on free and reduced-price school lunches, which may underestimate school poverty levels, particularly for older students and immigrant students.
Fall 1998:	10:1	17:1			
Fall 1999:	**7:1**	**16:1**	**15:1**		
Fall 2000:			10:1		
Fall 2001:			5:1		

Indicator 1.2 Internet access in high-poverty schools: Internet access in high-poverty school classrooms will be comparable to that in other schools.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of classrooms with Internet access

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Low-poverty schools	High-poverty schools	High-poverty schools
Fall 1994:	4	2	
Fall 1995:	9	5	
Fall 1996:	18	7	
Fall 1997:	36	14	
Fall 1998:	62	39	
Fall 1999:	**74**	**39**	**55**
Fall 2000:			100
Fall 2001:			100

Assessment of Progress

Status: No change.

Explanation: While there has been no change in the percentage of classrooms in high-poverty schools with Internet access, the number of high-poverty schools with Internet access rose to 90 percent in 1999, up from 80 percent in 1998. As high-poverty schools increasingly obtain access to the Internet, it is likely that their classroom connections will subsequently increase.

The band used to define "high-poverty schools" consists of schools in which 71 percent of students or more are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch; the band used to define "low poverty schools" is of schools in which less than 11 percent of students are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999 & 2000.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: February 2001 for fall 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Poverty measures are based on data on free and reduced-price school lunches, which may underestimate school poverty levels, particularly for older students and immigrant students.

Indicator 1.3 High poverty districts—Technology Literacy Challenge Fund: The number of states that award at least 66 percent of their TLCF funds to school districts designated as high-poverty will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1997:	27 of 50	Establish baseline
FY 1998:	Data not yet available	32 of 50
FY 1999:	**No data available**	35 of 50
FY 2000:		37 of 50
FY 2001:		50 of 50

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge.

Explanation: The FY 1997 performance covers the period from October 1996 to September 1998.

In September of 1998, 27 states reported awarding 66 percent or more of their FY 1997 TLCF allocation to districts they designated as high poverty.

There is no statutory TLCF requirement that a specific amount or percentage of state allocations be awarded to high-poverty districts, nor does the statute define poverty. States must, however, provide assistance to the districts with the highest numbers or percentages of children in poverty and the greatest need for technology. The amount of funding provided to high-poverty districts is dependent on state program implementation and the effectiveness of the Department's leadership with states.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Technology Literacy Challenge Fund online performance report.
Frequency: Annually.
Next update: 2000 (for FY 1998 data).

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by states. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations on Data and Planned Improvements: Subgrant allocation data is state self-reported and there is no alternative source. Reports on the distribution of funds are estimates (and may be substantially inaccurate) until the year following the end of their period of availability. Thus, state awards of FY 1998 funds are reported in 2000, following the end of their period of availability in September 1999.

OBJECTIVE 2: PROVIDE TEACHERS AND OTHER EDUCATORS WITH THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT THEY NEED TO HELP STUDENTS LEARN THROUGH THE USE OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY.

Indicator 2.1 Staff training and support: Increasing percentages of teachers will indicate that they feel very well prepared to integrate educational technology into classroom instruction.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Teacher Quality: Report on the Preparation of Public School Teachers, 1999.
FY 1998:	20%			*Frequency:* Biennially.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**	**Explanation:** In 1998, 20 percent of teachers reported that they were fully prepared to integrate technology in their instruction. Federal resources for training for teachers to use technology (including the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants) as well as state and local funds continue to support professional development in the use of educational technology for teachers and, correspondingly, progress toward the targets for this indicator.	*Next Update:* 2001 for fall 2000 data.
FY 2000:		40%		**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.
FY 2001		Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The data is self-report data on feelings of preparedness rather than objective measures of teachers' actual classroom practice. The resources required, in terms of cost and burden, to regularly gather data other than self-report data on teacher preparedness for a nationally representative sample are prohibitive.

Indicator 2.2 District professional development: The percentage of TLCF subgrantees that report professional development, as a primary use of funds will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of TLCF districts			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Technology Literacy Challenge Fund online performance report.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 1997:	55%	Baseline established	**Explanation:** The FY 1997 performance thus covers the period from October 1996 to September 1998.	*Next Update:* 2000 for FY 1998 Supplemental Study of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund.
FY 1998:	Data not yet available	60%		
FY 1999:	**Data not yet available**	**65%**	States conduct competitions under the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and have wide discretion to set priorities for those competitions. Districts also have considerable discretion (depending on the state) to direct the use of funds. States have been encouraged to devote at least 30 percent of funds to professional development related to educational technology beginning in 1998.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by states. No formal verification procedure applied.
FY 2000:		70%		
FY 2001:		75%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** District data are self-reported by districts to states that self-report to ED. Data are estimates from district technology coordinators for the most part. Of the 1997 subgrantee reports examined, 229 (11.6 percent) provided no data related to this indicator.

Indicator 2.3 Professional development models: An increasing percentage of TICG projects will develop models of professional development that result in improved instructional practice.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Evaluations conducted by the Technology Innovation Challenge grantees and reviewed by ED program and evaluation staff. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* September 2000.
1999:	**No data available**	**No data available**	**Explanation:** The mission of the Technology Innovation Challenge Grant program is to support the demonstration of new and innovative approaches to using technology to improve teaching and learning. Performance reports from projects due in late spring 2000 will provide the necessary data to respond to this indicator.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
2000:		10% of the total number of projects		
2001:		15% of the total number of projects		
2002:		20% of the total number of projects		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** FY 2000 will be the first time project performance information is collected through an online reporting system. Analysis of the operation of the system and the data collected will be conducted. Issues regarding consistency in reporting will be examined in this pilot year.

OBJECTIVE 3: PROMOTE THE AVAILABILITY AND USE OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY AS PART OF A CHALLENGING AND ENRICHING CURRICULUM IN EVERY SCHOOL.

Indicator 3.1 Classroom use: Students will increasingly use educational technology for learning in core academic subjects.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of students using computers in math

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Age 13	**Age 17**	**(Both grades)**
1978:	14%	12%	
1996:	54%	42%	
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**Data not yet available**	75%
2000:			Continuing increase
2001:			Continuing increase

Percentage of students using computers in writing

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Eighth grade	**Eleventh grade**	**(Both grades)**
1978:	15%	19%	
1996:	91%	96%	
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**Data not yet available**	98%
2000:			Continuing increase
2001:			Continuing increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Positive trend toward target.

Explanation: Computer use is fairly ubiquitous in writing. As computers become more available and knowledge about how to integrate computer use into instruction increases, computer use in mathematics also likely will increase.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: NAEP, 1996.
Frequency: Every 4 years.
Next Update: 2000 for 1999 data.

Validation Procedure: Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Questions yielding this data do not fully capture the extent to which computers are regularly used in classrooms to support instruction. For mathematics, NAEP asks students if they have ever studied math through computer instruction. For writing, NAEP asks students if they use a computer to write stories or papers.

Indicator 3.2 Progress on State Goals—Technology Literacy Challenge Fund: An increasing percentage of states will report progress on state goals related to integrating online and other technology resources into the curriculum.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of states			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Online performance report.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1997:	N/A	N/A	**Explanation:** States report progress on state goals related to the national goals in annual performance reports. Most states (46 of 50) have goals that relate to national IT goal concerning integrating IT resources into the curriculum. Progress on these goals for FY 1998 will be reported in 2000.	*Next Update:* 2000 (for 1998 data).
1998:	Data not yet available	Baseline established		
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**50%**		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by states. No formal verification procedure applied.
2000:		55%		
2001:		60%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** States report on their own goals and information cannot be added across states. There are currently no plans to establish common measures, although states will be provided with a critique of their goals resulting from the Supplemental Study analysis.

Indicator 3.3 Classroom impact: The percentage of projects that demonstrate positive impacts on curriculum and student achievement will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Evaluations conducted by the Technology Innovation Challenge grantees and reviewed by Office of Educational Research and Improvement program and evaluation staff.
1999:	**No data available**	**No data available**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		25% of projects	**Explanation:** The mission of the Technology Innovation Challenge Grant program is to support the demonstration of new and innovative approaches to using technology to improve teaching and learning. Performance reports from projects due in late spring 2000 will provide the necessary data to respond to this indicator. For the purposes of this assessment, student achievement may include improved attendance and discipline, acquisition of technology and telecommunications skills, problem-solving skills, performance or portfolio assessments, state assessment tools, or standardized tests.	*Next Update:* Summer 2000.
2001:		30% of projects		
2002:		35% of projects		**Validation Procedure:** [illegible] supplied by grantees. No formal veri[illegible]on procedure applied.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: FY 2000 will be the first time project performance information is collected through an online reporting system. Analysis of the operation of the system and the data collected will be conducted. Issues regarding consistency in reporting will be examined in this pilot year.

OBJECTIVE 4: HELP IMPROVE STUDENTS' INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LITERACY SKILLS IN ALL STATES.

Indicator 4.1 Standards for students in educational technology: The number of states that have standards for student proficiency in the use of technology will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** In 1997-98, 38 states had standards or graduation requirements pertaining to technology. A large portion of states already have technology standards in place for their students. As states increasingly devote resources to educational technology, they also increasingly focus on measuring the impact of educational technology. Setting standards is a precursor to that measurement of student proficiency.	**Source:** Education Week, Technology Counts, 1998; TLCF Profiles for future updates. *Frequency:* Planned. *Next Update:* Fall 2000 for 1999-2000 school year. **Validation Procedure:** Education Week Data supplied by Education Week. No formal verification procedure applied. TLCF Profile data will be provided by SRI International. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Education Week provides no detail on the rigor or comprehensiveness of standards.
1998:	38			
1999:	**No data available**	**42**		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000:		45		
2001:		46		

Indicator 4.2 Student proficiency in technology: In states that assess student proficiency in technology, the percentage of students that are proficient will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Data on this indicator has not yet been collected; however, collection of relevant data is planned through the TLCF Profiles project. Development of a test of student computer skills is being planned for future studies and evaluations.	**Source:** TLCF Profiles. *Frequency:* Planned. *Next Update:* Planned. **Validation Procedure:** Data to be supplied by SRI International. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Limitations of data will be defined as data is collected.
1999:	**No data available**	**No data available**		
2000:		Baseline to be established		
2001:		Increase over baseline		

OBJECTIVE 5: THROUGH THE CREATION OR EXPANSION OF COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY CENTERS IN DISADVANTAGED AREAS, IMPROVE ACCESS TO COMPUTERS, THE INTERNET, AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY.

Indicator 5.1 Customer reports on value of access: An increasing percentage of clients of the Community Technology Centers will report that access to computer technology improved their educational or employment outcomes.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data available, but baseline data are being established in 2000. Progress toward goal is likely. **Explanation:** The mission of the Community Technology Center program is to establish or expand community centers that increase access to computers, the Internet, and educational technology for residents of economically distressed communities. The program awarded its first grants in fall 1999.	**Source:** Annual performance report, customer satisfaction survey. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* January 2001 **Validation procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification process procedure applied. **Limitations of data and planned improvements:** FY 2000 will be the first time project performance information is collected. Issues regarding consistency in reporting will be examined in this year. Satisfaction measures will be self-reported from clients.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No data available**		
FY 2000		Continuing increase		
FY 2001		Continuing increase		
FY 2002		85%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Provide financial and technical assistance to expand classroom access, particularly in high-poverty schools, to modern multimedia computers, the Internet, networked learning environments, engaging software, and on-line resources integrated with school curricula.
- Coordinate with related technology initiatives at the Federal, state, and local levels and with professional development programs to promote effective use of educational technology.
- Identify effective approaches for using educational technology to improve student achievement in core subjects and disseminate information on these approaches. Also identify effective approaches for improving students' technology literacy and disseminate information on these approaches.
- Support development of assessments that measure students' technology proficiency.
- Connect with institutions of higher education (including colleges of education) for high-quality pre-service and in-service training for teachers in educational technology.
- Develop models that provide teachers with sustained training and support in the use of technology for improved instruction.
- Encourage development and demonstration of effective strategies for improving the use of educational technology, particularly in high-poverty schools, and for training teachers to effectively use technology in instruction.
- Identify gaps in data sources on use and effectiveness of educational technology, and work to fill those information gaps.
- Work with the Federal Communications Commission to expand schools' access to advanced telecommunications.
- Encourage states to use their Federal funds to leverage and coordinate with other programs to support effective use of educational technology.
- Report to report on states' progress relative to their own goals and to target program improvement efforts within states and to identify success in integrating technology into school curricula.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Continue to coordinate with the E-rate administered by the Federal Communication Commission's Schools and Libraries Division.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- Technology Innovation Challenge Grants are working collaboratively with the Star Schools program to expand their efforts in the area of distance education to extend the range of professional development offerings. They are also working jointly with the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program to link preservice training to K-12 classroom activities. Grantees are also taking advantage of the E-rate discounts provided by the Federal Communications Commission to leverage the telecommunications costs. The TLCF coordinates with the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program, and within states requires district plans that coordinates e-rate subsidies with other sources of funding.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- In general, the Technology Innovation Challenge Grant program is meeting the established program goal. One of the challenges that continues to face the program, however, is staying on the forefront of educational reform as new and emerging technologies continue to be developed in business and industry. In addition, the program faces the challenges of institutionalizing and replicating new learning approaches systemically.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was changed to more specifically focus on NAEP and to include specific targets as FY 2000 Indicator 1.1.
- FY 1999 Indicator 3.3 was modified as Indicator 3.2 in FY 2000 to be more specific; the reference to librarians was removed.
- Dates in Indicator 5.2 were updated.
- The wording of Indicator 6.1 was simplified.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2 was dropped.
- Indicator 3.2 was dropped.
- Indicators 4.4 and 4.5 were dropped.
- Indicator 6.2 was dropped.
- For FY 2000 Indicator 7.2, a reference to the state and local levels was added to the FY 1999 Indicator 7.2.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- The order of the indicators was changed. Indicator numbers in the items below refer to number from the FY 2000 annual plan.
- The wording of Objective 2 (Help improve students' technology literacy through federal educational technology programs along with other federal programs and state and local reform efforts) was simplified.
- The wording of Indicator 2.1 (Student proficiency in technology: between 1998 and 2001, the percentage of students who demonstrate proficiency in using multimedia computers and the Internet will increase) was modified.
- Objective 3 (Provide practicing and prospective teachers with the professional development and support they need to help students learn through modern multi-media computers and the Internet) was simplified by replacing "practicing and prospective teachers" with "teacher and other educators" and "modern multi-media computers and the Internet" with "educational technology."
- Indicator 3.2 (Staff training and support: increasing proportions of teachers will have the professional development and the administrative, technical, and local financial support they need to help students learn through modern multimedia computers and the Internet) was modified to better align with the survey question used to obtain the performance data.
- Objective 6 was simplified by replacing "technology-based curricula and the resources of the Internet" with "educational technology."

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

- Indicator 6.1 Classroom use (An increasing number of teachers will integrate high-quality technology based curriculum into their instruction) was modified to read "students will increasingly use educational technology for learning in core academic subjects" to better align the indicator with the data source.

Dropped

- Former Indicator 1.1 (Shared indicator of national student performance) was deleted because connections between the use of educational technology and changes in broad measures of national student performance cannot reliably be made.
- Former Indicator 3.1 (Certification tied to technology training: training in the use of modern multimedia computers and the Internet for effective instruction will be increasingly required for certification and accreditation of practicing and prospective teachers, schools, and districts) was deleted.
- Former Indicator 4.1 (Student access: the ratio of students to modern multimedia computers in public schools will improve to 5 students per modern multimedia computer by the year 2000) was deleted because the Indicator 1.1 adequately captures the construct and Volume I, Objective 1.7 of the Department's strategic plan includes a similar indicator.
- Former Indicator 5.1 (School access: the percentage of public schools with access to the Internet will increase to 95 percent by 2000) and Indicator 5.2 (Classroom access: the percentage of public school instructional rooms connected to the Internet will increase from 14 percent in 1996 to higher percentages thereafter) were deleted because the new Indicator 1.2 adequately captures the construct and Volume I, Objective 1.7 of the Department's strategic plan includes a similar indicator.
- Former Indicator 4.3 (Effective technologies: students with disabilities will have access to effective technologies for learning) was deleted because serving students with disabilities is not a focus of either TLCF or TICG; equal access for students with disabilities is required by law; and Volume I, Objective 1.7 of the Department's strategic plan includes a similar indicator.
- Objective 7 (Promote effective federal program management and guidance to support state and local implementation of statewide technology plans and the use of innovative strategies).
- Former Indicator 7.1 (The technical assistance and other support that the U.S. Department of Education provides, either directly or through its programs, will be of high quality and useful, and will be judged by customers as adequate to meet their needs) was deleted from the program performance plan to be used internally for program management purposes.
- Former Indicator 7.2 (Private sector collaboration: private sector participation in planning, support, and implementation of educational technology at the state and local levels will increase) was deleted from the program performance plan to be used internally for program management purposes.

New

- Current Indicator 1.2 was added.
- Current Indicators 2.3 and 3.3 were added.
- Indicator 5.1 to include Community Technology Centers.

STAR SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Goal: To improve student learning and teaching through the use of distance learning technologies.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Star Schools Program supports Objective 1.7 (schools use advanced technology to improve education) by providing grants to support distance education.

FY 2000—$50,550,000

FY 2001—Star Schools is proposed for consolidation under the Next Generation Technology Innovation program. Total FY 2001 request is $170,000,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE TEACHING AND LEARNING THROUGH INCREASED ACCESS TO DISTANCE EDUCATION.

Indicator 1.1 Non-traditional settings: The number of learners in non-traditional settings (community centers, correctional facilities, etc.) who participate in distance education will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of students in nontraditional settings served by Star Schools			**Status:** Service to students in non-traditional settings including correctional facilities, community centers, and homes increased.	**Source:** Annual performance reports, 1999; national program evaluation results, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	278,744			
1999:	**291,287**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** As new grants are funded through the program, an increasing number of projects target non-traditional settings. As a result, more students are likely to participate who traditionally have not had an opportunity to participate in distance learning activities.	**Validation Procedure:** Site visits and project evaluations. Data correspond to an increase in the number of projects serving students in non-traditional settings.
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are reported by the projects, and no formal process for validating project reports has been conducted to date.

OBJECTIVE 2: PROMOTE THE DELIVERY OF CHALLENGING CONTENT IN CORE SUBJECTS.

Indicator 2.1 Challenging content: Challenging content aligned with standards at all academic levels (including high school credit, advanced placement, adult education, and Graduate Equivalency Diploma courses) through distance education will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of full credit courses offered through Star Schools			**Status:** We anticipate that more on-line courses and enrichment modules may be developed over the next year due to increased interest in Web-based curriculum offerings. Program staff will be examining the extent to which challenging content, which may include credit courses, as well as new models of curriculum development will be available through distance learning activities.	**Source:** Star Schools project evaluations, 1999; annual performance reports, 1999; national program evaluation, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1994:	More than 30			
1997:	81			
1998:	105			
1999:	**126**	**Continuing Increase**	**Explanation:** Pending OMB clearance, data on alignment with standards will be collected in spring 2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Site visits and project evaluations.
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are from the project reports. As a consequence it is difficult to validate information.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		An annual on-line reporting system is being developed, and data will be collected in fall 2000 to determine whether content is aligned with standards.

KEY STRATEGIES

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Use NCES data to identify communities representing high populations of underserved students. Develop and update an on-line map of communities participating in the program.
- Work with project directors and program evaluators to ensure that relevant and high-quality data on schools, non-traditional settings, and technology access are collected on an annual basis.
- Provide access to standards materials on-line and via print (by subject area). Convene workshops and provide technical assistance about aligning standards to programming with resources from other federally sponsored programs.
- Disseminate information about Star Schools course offerings through the Department's Web site, workshops, and national meetings.
- In collaboration with R*TECs and other ED programs, provide financial and technical assistance and disseminate information about successful models to support staff professional development.
- In collaboration with other programs, increase research-based practice about the use and impact of distance learning through research, evaluation, and dissemination activities.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The Star Schools program is working collaboratively with the Technology Innovation Challenge Grant program, Community Technology Centers, and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund to expand its efforts in the area of distance education to extend the range of professional development offerings. It is also working jointly with the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program to link preservice training to K-12 classroom activities. Grantees are also taking advantage of the E-rate discounts provided by the Federal Communications Commission to leverage the telecommunications costs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- One of the major challenges is gathering accurate data on unregistered participants in projects and in assessing project impact as one part of broader instruction. To meet this challenge, the program will fund a study that will look at the various stratagems to count unregistered participants and cable users. The program will also set aside funds to conduct an impact evaluation.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Objective 2 (promote the delivery of challenging and engaging content) was modified by deleting the word engaging.
- Indicators 2.1 and 2.2 were collapsed into one indicator.

Dropped

- Objective 3 (promote excellence in teaching by sustaining professional development and integrating new technologies into the curriculum) was deleted.
- Indicators 3.1 through 3.4 were deleted.
- Objective 4 (contribute to the available body of knowledge on use of technology to enhance learning to high standards for all students) was deleted.
- Indicator 4.1 was deleted.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1 (challenging content) was modified to read, "Challenging content aligned with standards at all academic levels…."

Dropped—None.

New—None.

REGIONAL TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION CONSORTIA (R*TECS)

Goal: To improve teaching and learning by providing technical assistance and professional development for the effective use of educational technology.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: R*TECs provide technical assistance to support strategic plan Objective 1.1 (states develop and implement standards), Objective 1.4 (talented and dedicated teachers), Objective 1.5 (families and communities), Objective 1.7 (technology), Objective 2.4 (special populations help), Objective 3.4 (lifelong learning), and Objective 4.3 (research, evaluation and improvement).

FY 2000—$10,000,000

FY 2001—$10,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROMOTE EFFECTIVE USE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING THROUGH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND THE LEVERAGING AND COORDINATION OF OTHER RESOURCES.

Indicator 1.1 Recipients of R*TEC products, services and information-particularly those representing underserved schools: At least 85 percent of recipients (individuals or agencies) of the R*TEC services and products – including those developed and produced through the Consortia, collaboration among R*TECs, and strategic alliances – will indicate that these products and services are of high quality and meet their needs.

Targets and Performance Data

*Percentage of R*TEC Clients in **FY 1999** who agree or strongly agree that R*TEC services and products are*

	Services (85% Baseline)	Products (85% Baseline)
High Quality	84%	93%
Relevant to Needs	74%	89%

*Percentage of R*TEC Clients in **FY 1999** who agree or strongly agree that R*TEC services and products are useful for*

Improving Student Learning	73%	83%
Equitable Access	61%	67%
Integrating Technology	71%	84%
Making Better-Informed Decisions	70%	73%

Assessment of Progress

Status: FY 1999 data show target exceeded in the products area and targets nearly met in the services area.

Explanation: R*TEC projects collect client ratings on a number of relevant elements. The data used in this report reflect an overall measure of quality and relevance to client needs.

Closer analysis of the data reported by projects shows the following:

- In all categories, the percentage of clients that strongly agree with a particular rating (rather than simply agree) has increased compared with FY 1998.
- The ratings pertaining to impact were asked of all respondents, regardless of whether relevant to the service or product received; this resulted in a relatively large number of respondents who "neither agreed nor disagreed" with some of the statements.
- Client satisfaction among those who work with underserved clients was generally equal or higher than among R*TEC clients overall.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Second Annual Program Performance Report, FY 1999.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by individual R*TEC projects, through the work of external evaluators hired by the projects. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The program faces two distinct challenges in collecting reliable data. One is the lack of completely external sources of data on program performance (data are collected by the project evaluators). In FY 2001, the Department will begin external evaluation activities.
The other is that there are slight variations in data collection practices and procedures across projects. Consistent methods and definitions will be developed and agreed to in FY 2000 and 2001.
Furthermore, the 2001 projects will discuss capturing only the most relevant subset of quality and impact ratings for each service or product to be rated, thus providing a better picture of perceived impact.

**See Challenges section below.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Disseminate high-quality information and resources on the effective planning and use of technology in education.
- Assess customer satisfaction about major areas of work, and document and evaluate performance
- Collaborate with SEAs, LEAs, and other educational entities to inform and support better planning, increased access to technologies, more advanced uses of technology, and enhanced instructional practice.
- Support increasing communication and collaboration among consortia and coordination with other programs, particularly those that focus on educational technology.
- Assess the value and impact of alliances (through surveys, focus groups, or other means of inquiry) and use the findings to improve alliances over time.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To address concerns about data reliability, the Department will start engaging in some external evaluation activities starting with the upcoming new cycle of R*TEC grants. The Department is also meeting with present R*TEC projects in early 2000 to discuss better consistency in data collection practices between projects; the outcome of these discussions will also affect the new cycle of grantees who will receive awards in 2000.
- To address the continued challenges faced by the program with respect to a rapidly evolving field, the Department is fostering continued sharing among R*TEC and with other experts. Furthermore, the need to keep abreast of latest technological developments has been stressed in the recompetition application package for prospective grantees to consider.
- To address concerns regarding the very limited resources available to R*TECs, the Department continues to engage each project in conversations about the most effective service delivery strategies, and in ensuring tha key products and services developed by one R*TEC can become available and known beyond their region.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Many important educational technology initiatives by all levels of government as well as the private sector have been launched since inception of the R*TEC program. R*TEC grantees have played a variety of roles in order to leverage resources to benefit customers: collaborators, providing technical assistance and other forms of support, linking with other resources, playing an advisory or facilitator role, acting as catalysts, conveners, building and sustaining networks and playing an advocacy role (source: First Annual Program Performance Report, FY 1998).
- Specifically regarding collaboration and coordination with other federally funded technology-focused projects and programs, both Department staff and individual R*TEC projects have initiated collaboration or responded to requests for the same. We have included a few examples of programs that are not federally funded because of their importance to the field—the purposes of each initiative are known to the reader and are not described here in detail:
  - Department staff and staff at other agencies have consulted to coordinate an appropriate role for the R*TECs to help launch critical initiatives. As a result, R*TEC projects provided technical assistance and helped organize and host informational meetings. This has been the case for such programs as FCC's E-rate, the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, the Technology Innovation Challenge Grant, the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology Program, and HUD and Agriculture's Empowerment Zones initiative.
  - R*TEC projects, on their own initiative and while keeping Department staff informed, have initiated collaborations with such efforts as the Council of Chief State School Officers' work with state technology coordinators, Milken Foundation/Milken Exchange project to develop teacher competencies in the use of technology for teaching and learning, the International Society for Technology in Education's (ISTE's) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education's (NCATE's) initiatives on developing technology standards, and the National Science Foundation's Urban and Rural Systemic Initiatives.
  - R*TEC projects have actively participated as presenters at regional and national conferences.
    Additionally, R*TECs collaborate with State Education Agencies and other education representatives within states (e.g., universities, intermediate service units) to leverage educational technology resources.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The field is changing very rapidly in its adoption of educational technology infrastructures, and new initiatives are being launched rapidly at all levels of government and within communities. This requires frequent adjustments in R*TEC service delivery strategies and priorities setting efforts, as well as continuous professional development.
- The needs of the field are quite broad, and R*TECs are still learning how to leverage and target very limited resources within an extremely broad programmatic charter.

****Data Collection Practices**

Data collection practices have changed somewhat from 1998 to 1999 and while each set of data stands on its own, longitudinal comparisons between these two years may not be entirely meaningful. Conversations with projects planned for early 2000 regarding consistency in data collection will likely result in some substantive adjustments for future years.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- The four indicators that focused on products, services and client satisfaction were combined into one indicator that focuses on client satisfaction and captures many of the elements from the old plan. The projects still capture rather comprehensive data about the breadth of their work and its impact on customers, reporting the full set of data in their Annual Program Performance Report.

Dropped

- The two indicators specifically focusing on the leveraging and coordination of resources have been dropped from the plan submitted to Congress—data pertinent to this subject are still being captured by the projects through their system-wide collection and reported in their Annual Program Performance Report.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 (performance measures) now includes customer's assessment of the areas in which R*TEC's performance will have an impact.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

READY-TO-LEARN TELEVISION

Goal: To develop, produce, and distribute video programming and educational materials for preschool and elementary school children and their parents in order to facilitate the achievement of the National Education Goal for all children in America to start school ready to learn.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1. Department-wide Objectives: Ready to Learn (RTL) Television's activities support Objectives 2.1 (children enter school ready to learn) and 2.2 (reading) through the development and distribution of educational video for preschool and elementary school children and their parents. Another feature of the program is training parents and caregivers through community partnerships, which supports Objective 1.5 (families and communities).

FY 2000—$16,000,000

FY 2001—$16,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: DEVELOP, PRODUCE, AND DISTRIBUTE HIGH-QUALITY TELEVISED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING AND WRITTEN EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS FOR PRESCHOOL AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN AND THEIR CAREGIVERS.

Indicator 1.1 Distribution of educational television programs: Ready to Learn (RTL) programs will reach an increasing number of viewers.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of stations			**Status:** Number of stations, target met. A baseline has yet to be determined for number of viewers. The first series aired in the fall of 1999 and a second series will premiere in spring 2000.	**Source:** Performance Reports from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; PBS/RTL stations. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995:	48			
1999:	**130**	**No target set**		
2000:	132	132	**Explanation:** Positive movement towards target is expected.	Reports from producers, WGBH-Boston, and The Children's Television Workshop. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000.
2001:		137		
Number of viewers			The number of stations participating in RTL has grown from 48 in 1995 to 132 in 2000. The current number represents a potential reach of 99% of the nation. The total number of children and adults reached through RTL services is 5,503,842.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
1999:	**First update 2000**	**Continuing increase**		
2000:		4.5 to 6 million adult and young viewers weekly		
2001:		Continuing increase	Annual programming analyses are collected routinely at a 6-month and year-end cycles from PBS/ RTL stations and CPB. The numbers of viewers will be entered to provide indicator analysis that can reflect viewers as well as stations.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** While the number of RTL stations may increase, this does not ensure that the number of viewers will increase. Ratings for shows will be included in reports as available. Viewer statistics are not available but will be available. A 2-year evaluative study of RTL Services is due by mid-2000.

OBJECTIVE 2: PROVIDE TRAINING TO EDUCATION PERSONNEL IN THE PUBLIC TELEVISION COMMUNITY SO THAT THEY CAN TRAIN PARENTS AND CAREGIVERS TO HELP CHILDREN BECOME READY TO LEARN.

Indicator 2.1 Training for parents and caregivers: The number of parents and caregivers trained will increase to 600,000 in FY 2000.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of parents and caregivers trained			**Status:** No target set, but progress is likely.	**Source:** CPB Annual Performance Reports, 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Number of parents and caregivers trained is projected to increase in both 2000 and 2001.	*Frequency*: Biennially. *Next Update*: 2000.
1995:	45,447			**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
1996:	118,274		In 1995, 23,187 caregivers were trained. In 1996, 74,049 caregivers were trained. In 1997, 98,015 caregivers were trained. In 1998, 146,392 caregivers were trained. In 1999, 309,454 caregivers were trained. We anticipate training 340,000 caregivers will be trained in 2000 and 380,000 in 2001.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Combined with the ever-changing problems of meeting the needs of working parents and the schedule of overburdened caregivers.
1997:	219,256			
1998:	332,523			
1999:	**563,075**	**246,274**		
2000:		600,000		
2001:		650,000		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

Monitor progress of current projects and monitor program quality. For example, review performance reports from the CPB, the Children's Television Workshop, and WGBH-Boston.

- To address the issue of collaboration, the program will participate in developing and supporting collaborations with other Federal agencies, foundations, and related early childhood groups.
- To address the issue of distributing educational materials and information, the program will support the development and use of workshops to distribute educational material and information to caregivers and children.
- To address the issue of providing information over the Web, the program will provide educational materials through the RTL Web site.
- To address the issue of training quality, the program will evaluate the training quality and RTL programming and outreach activities.
- To address the issue of training for RTL Coordinators, the program will support and develop workshops for training of RTL coordinators and caregivers.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Other agencies (Federal and non-Federal) working in collaboration with RTL stations include HUD, Head Start, Child Care, HHS, DOJ, Maternal and Child Health, NAEYC, local AEYC affiliates, local hospitals, libraries, early childhood professional associations, institutions of higher education, local literacy initiatives and other mission-related organizations. Through these contacts, outreach services distribute children's books and the RTL magazine—PBS Families/Para la Familia—provide parenting classes, support professional networking and continuous education experiences for families and education professionals.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- It is expected that challenges for RTL Coordinators will originate out of a wide range of socioeconomic, educational, and cultural differences that they represent for a program developed and implemented as a national model. Offering workshops that can meet the wide range of needs and learning styles requires skill and much preparation to be successful and thorough. Coordinators strive hard to provide the best quality sessions, resources, and materials for workshop participants in their diverse communities. The national RTL office works equally hard to support the coordinators with professional development and materials that reflect the current research, are thorough, accurate, and yet, flexible enough that coordinators can adapt to their needs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

Dropped

- Indicators 1.2, 1.3, and 2.2 were dropped from the plan as output, rather than outcome, indicators.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR MATHEMATICS

Goal: To improve the learning and teaching of mathematics through the use of technology.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics provides support for Objectives 1.7 and 2.3. The program provides assistance to teachers through the development of broadcast programming, videos, support materials, and on-line services to improve student skills in and understanding of mathematics.

FY 2000—$8,500,000

FY 2001—Funds for the Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics are being requested under the Telecommunications Program for Professional Development, which is proposed to replace this program. The total FY 2001 request is $5,000,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: PROMOTE EXCELLENT TEACHING IN MATHEMATICS THROUGH SUSTAINED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER NETWORKS.

Indicator 1.1: Increasing participation in sustained professional development: The number of teachers sharing resources and engaged in other professional development activities through on-line learning communities will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of teachers who shared resources and engaged in other professional development activities through Telecommunications Demonstration Project on-line learning communities			**Status:** No change. New awards anticipated in FY 2000, which may result in subsequent modifications of targets in outyears.	**Source:** Annual review of grant performance reports, 1999; teacher surveys collected by the project, 1999.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Current project ends September 2000. New award(s) expected to be made by spring 2000. A new award is anticipated in FY 2000, which may result in subsequent modifications of targets in outyears.	*Frequency:* Annually.
1997	5,500			*Next Update:* Summer 2000.
1998	5,800			
1999:	**5,800**	**Continuous increase**		**Validation Procedure:** No formal verification procedure applied.
2000		6,090		
2001		New grant award(s), target to be determined by spring 2001		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Grantee provides data.
2002		To be added pending new award(s) made in spring 2000		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Provide financial assistance to support development of videos, support materials, and on-line services. Based on needs identified by the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) data and other national math assessments, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement will work with the Public Broadcasting Service to develop a specific focus and content for math programming.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- In FY 2000, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement added the performance indicator to the application for the new competition in FY 2000. As a result, the new grantee(s) will be required to address the indicator in their applications. In addition, the applications will be reviewed on the basis of the extent to which they have adequately responded to the indicator.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics will collaborate with the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics Science Education to be sure that products are shared. Other federally funded projects and programs include the Star Schools Program, the Regional Technology in Education Consortia (R*TEC), the Eisenhower Consortia and Clearinghouse, and other technology demonstration programs funded under Title III. Program staff will consider the relevance of such coordination for the new grantee(s) anticipated in FY 2000 and report accordingly.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- The program goal is being met, and evidence of sustained teacher professional development has been reported.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 were merged for clarity.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.3: "An increasing proportion of participating teachers will report improvements in practice and methods that align with standards resulting from sharing resources through on-line learning communities" has been dropped. No current data are available from the existing project that meets this indicator.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

PREPARING TOMORROW'S TEACHERS TO USE TECHNOLOGY

Goal: To improve the knowledge and ability of future teachers to use technology in improved teaching practices and student learning opportunities, and to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This initiative supports Objectives 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 1.7 (schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education) by providing competitive grants to consortia that implement improvements in teacher preparation programs.

FY 2000—$75,000,000

FY 2001—$150,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: STRENGTHEN TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS SO THAT THEY PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY TRAINING IN THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES.

Indicator 1.1 Curriculum redesign: The percentage of funded teacher preparation programs that redesign their curriculum to incorporate best practices in the use of technology in teacher education will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Sources:** Project Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* December 2000
1999:	**New program for 1999**	**New program for 1999**		
2000:		New program for 1999	**Explanation:** This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	Formative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2000
2001:		Baseline to be set in 2001		Summative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002
				Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified through on-site monitoring and review and through survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.

Indicator 1.2 Technology-proficient faculty: The percentage of faculty members in funded teacher preparation programs that effectively use technology in their teaching will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	**Sources:** Project Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* December 2000 Summative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002 **Validation Procedures:** Evaluation data collection will be verified through on-site monitoring and review and through survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.
1999:	**New program for 1999**	**New program for 1999**		
2000:		New program for 1999		
2001:		Baseline to be set in 2001		

Indicator 1.3 Graduation requirements: The number of funded teacher preparation programs that will require teacher candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the effective use of technology in teaching and learning will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** This is a new program so program-specific performance data are not yet available. However, related national-level data are available from "Technology Counts," a report issued annually by Education Week. According to "Technology Counts '99," 42 states require that teacher preparation programs include technology. Two limitations to these data are that preparation requirements vary widely among states and that inclusion of technology in teacher preparation does not imply that new teachers are proficient in technology.	**Sources:** Project Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* December 2000 Summative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002 "Technology Counts," Education Week. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* Fall 2000 **Validation Procedures:** "Technology Counts" data corroborated by internal review procedures of an experienced data collection agency. Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review as well as survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
1999:	**New program for 1999**	**New program for 1999**		
2000:		New program for 1999		
2001:		Baseline to be set in 2001		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees.

Indicator 1.4 Learning resources: The percentage of teacher preparation programs that use Web-based, multimedia learning resources, course materials, and teaching tools will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.	**Sources:** Project Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* December 2000
1999:	**New program for 1999**	**New program for 1999**		
2000:		New program for 1999		
2001:		Baseline to be set in 2001	**Explanation:** This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	Summative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002 **Validation Procedures:** Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review as well as survey and analysis performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national-level baseline data for this indicator.

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE TECHNOLOGY SKILLS AND PROFICIENCY OF NEW TEACHERS FOR IMPROVED CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.

Indicator 2.1 Technology-proficient new teachers: The percentage of new teachers who are proficient in using technology and integrating technology into instructional practices will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Sources:** Summative Evaluation. *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002
1999:	**New program for 1999**	**New program for 1999**		
2000:		New program for 1999	**Explanation:** This is a new program so program-specific performance data are not yet available. However, related national-level data are available for this indicator from the NCES report, *Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers*. According to this report, in 1998, only 24 percent of new teachers (with 0 to 3 years of teaching experience) felt "very well prepared" to integrate educational technology in the grade or subject they taught.	NCES, Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers, 1998 *Frequency:* Every 2 years *Next Update:* January 2001
2001:		New program for 1999		
2002:		Baseline to be set in 2002		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedures: *Teacher Quality:* Data validated by NCES's review procedures and *NCES Statistical Standards*. Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review as well as and survey and analysis performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees.

OBJECTIVE 3: CREATE INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE IN THE PREPARATION OF FUTURE TEACHERS TO USE TECHNOLOGY.

Indicator 3.1 Sustained program activities: At least 35 percent of program consortia members will continue to implement reform in pre-service teacher training for at least 2 years following the termination of Federal funding.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Summative Evaluation. *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002
1999:	**New program for 1999**	**New program for 1999**		
2000:		New program for 1999	**Explanation:** This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	
2001:		New program for 1999		
2002:		Baseline to be set in 2002		**Validation Procedures:** Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review as well as survey and analysis performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.

Indicator 3.2 Inter-disciplinary partnerships: The percentage of teacher preparation programs that communicate, collaborate and partner together with schools of arts and sciences on a regular and formal basis will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Sources:** Project Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* December 2000
1999:	**New program for 1999**	**New program for 1999**		
2000:		New program for 1999	**Explanation:** This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	
2001:		Baseline to be set in 2001		Formative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2000 Summative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national-level baseline data for this indicator.

Indicator 3.3 K-16 partnerships: The percentage of teacher preparation programs that communicate, collaborate, and partner together with the K-12 community on a regular and formal basis will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Sources:** Project Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* December 2000
1999:	**New program for 1999**	**New program for 1999**		
2000:		New program for 1999	**Explanation:** This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Formative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2000
2001:		Baseline to be set in 2001		Summative Evaluation *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002 **Validation Procedures:** Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, as well as survey and analysis performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.

OBJECTIVE 4: CREATE STATEWIDE CHANGE IN THE PREPARATION OF FUTURE TEACHERS TO USE TECHNOLOGY.

Indicator 4.1 State teacher certification standards: The number of states that include technology proficiency as a component of their initial teacher certification standards will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states that have technology-related requirements as a component of their initial teacher certification standards			**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** Data from the Milken report includes states that require teachers to meet a technology requirement either through credit hours of coursework or through a performance-based assessment. Data for 1999 are not available from any of the data sources for this indicator. However, 1998 data from the Milken report demonstrate that in addition to the 15 states that currently have technology requirements for certification, 7 states are in the process of adopting standards. This indicates that progress is likely in increasing the percentage of states meeting this goal.	**Sources:** Milken Exchange on Education Technology's report, Education Technology Policies of the 50 States. *Frequency:* One-time survey *Next Update:* Unknown Project Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* December 2000 Summative Evaluation. *Frequency:* Longitudinal *Next Update:* 2002 **Validation Procedures:** Education Technology Policies of the 50 States: data supplied by the Milken Exchange on Education Policy; data corroborated by internal review procedures of an experienced data collection agency. Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, as well as survey and analysis performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	15 states			
1999:	**No data available**	**5 states**		
2000:		18 states		
2001:		20 states		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To address the use of effective practices for teacher preparation programs, the program office will encourage the sharing of information among grantees through a peer collaboration process and the development of a grantee Web site.
- To address reporting requirements, the program office will provide technical assistance to grantees on topics such as evaluation, and it will ensure the accurate interpretation of program activities and requirements.
- To address the outreach and communication efforts of the Department, the program office will work with professional organizations to promote program goals through participation in national, state, and regional conferences. The program office will also sponsor workshops to help potential applicants learn about the program and facilitate the sharing of information on effective strategies across consortium grantees.

New or Strengthened Strategies

None.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- To address the issue of evaluation, the program office will continue to work with ED's Office of Educatic Technology to coordinate and participate in national conferences such as the Secretary's Conference on Educational Technology: "Evaluation the Effectiveness of Technology."
- To address teacher quality, the program office will coordinate with the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants program to collaborate on common issues of preparedness, certification, and technology.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

None.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New

- All indicators are new to the FY 2001 Annual Plan.

RECOGNITION AND REWARD

Goal: To increase the number of states that increase student achievement in the core academic subjects, narrow the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This initiative supports Objective 1.1 by encouraging and recognizing states that develop challenging standards that raise achievement and close the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students.

FY 2001—$50,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP BETWEEN HIGH- AND LOW- PERFORMING STUDENTS WILL BE REDUCED.

Indicator 1.1 The number of states that are able to demonstrate increased student achievement and a reduction in the gap between high- and low-performing students will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program. (Baseline data are 1996 NAEP math results.)	**Source:** Program evaluation. *Frequency:* Biennially. Alternate subject tests are administered biennially. *Next Update:* 2001.
FY 1999:	**Not Applicable**	**Not applicable**		
FY 2000:	Math data are being collected	10 states		
FY 2001:	Math data will be reported	Not applicable	**Explanation:** New program.	
FY 2002:	Reading data will be collected and benchmarked	Target to be determined		**Validation Procedure:** NCES language for state NAEP tests.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Not all states are participating in state NAEP. In 2000 at least nine states will not be participating.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

Not applicable.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Work to get more states to participate in NAEP state tests.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To be established.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

GOALS 2000 STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT

Goal: To support comprehensive state and local education reform tied to high standards for all students.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Goals 2000 funds the development of standards (Objective 1.1), teacher quality (Objective 1.4), and family and community involvement (Objective 1.5). It also authorizes the establishment of Ed-Flex, which provides states with waiver authority (Objective 4.2).
FY 2000—$491,000,000
FY 2001—$0 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: HELP IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN CORE SUBJECTS THROUGH GOALS 2000 OPERATING IN CONCERT WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES.

Indicator 1.1 Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: States and districts that have implemented systemic, standards-based reform will show increases in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficient levels in reading and math on their state assessment systems.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Goals 2000 Evaluation Design study.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Planned.
2000:		Baseline to be established	**Explanation:** Goals 2000 began the Federal effort to promote systemic, standards-based reform and is aligned closely with ESEA Title I requirements for standards. With implementation beginning in 1995, state standards were expected to be in place in 1998 and aligned assessments in 2000. It is following such implementation that we expect to be able to measure progress of students against the standards.	*Next Update:* Planned.
2001:		Increase over baseline		**Validation Procedure:** No formal verification procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data will be collected and reported in accordance with ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

OBJECTIVE 2: STIMULATE AND ACCELERATE STATE AND LOCAL REFORM EFFORTS.

Indicator 2.1 Standards for core subjects: All states will have content and performance standards in place in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
States with content standards			**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** Title I peer review records.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1999:	**48**	**All**	**Explanation:** Goals 2000 is aligned closely with ESEA Title I, which requires states to have content and performance standards in place by 1998. The challenges to states in developing and implementing content and performance standards were more difficult than those anticipated in the timeline established in IASA for implementation.	*Next Update:* 2000.
2000:		All		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by Title I Program Office. No formal verification procedure applied.
2001:		All		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
States with performance standards			As a result, several states requested and received waivers allowing extensions of the deadlines for having performance standards in place.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Title I peer review guidance directs determination of status of content and performance standards. By design and by the legislation, Title I peer review records are the authoritative data source for this indicator.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**29**	**All**		
2000:		All		
2001:		All		

Indicator 2.2 Aligned assessments: By 2000-01, all states will have assessments aligned to content and performance standards for mathematics and reading or language arts.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
States are required to have aligned assessments in place by 2000-01; in 1999, no states submitted evidence to ED that they have final assessments in place.			**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** Goals 2000 is aligned closely with ESEA Title I requirements, which require states to have aligned assessments by 2000-01. Goals 2000 is using the Title I process for evaluating progress in developing aligned assessments. In 2000, it is expected that states will begin to submit evidence that they have developed and are implementing aligned assessments. ED distributed peer review guidance for aligned assessments in fall 1999 and conducted technical workshops for states.	**Source:** Title I peer review records. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Title I peer review guidance directs determination of assessment alignment. By design and by the legislation, Title I peer review records are the authoritative data source for this indicator.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**N/A**	**N/A**		
2000:		40		
2001:		All		

Indicator 2.3 School's alignment of key processes: Principals in states or districts with standards will indicate that increasing percentages of schools have curriculum, instruction, professional development, and assessments aligned to standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage reporting curriculum and instruction aligned			**Status:** Positive trend toward targets. **Explanation:** In the 1998-99 school year, for reading and mathematics, 69 percent of principals reported that their schools have curriculum and instruction aligned with standards to a great extent, 70 percent reported that changes in professional development have occurred as a result of the implementation of standards, 38 percent reported assessments aligned to standards to a great extent, and 26 percent reported alignment in all three of these areas. Questions yielding data for the 1997-98 school year are similar to, but not exactly the same as, questions yielding the data for the 1998-99 school year.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, unpublished tabulations. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001 for 1999-2000. School-Level Implementation of Standards-based Reform, 1999. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by Westat. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data is self-reported from principals.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	51			
1999:	**69**	**Continuous increase**		
2000:		75		
2001:		N/A		
Percentage reporting professional development aligned				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	41			
1999:	**70**	**Continuous increase**		
2000:		75		
2001:		N/A		
Percentage reporting assessments aligned				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	35			
1999:	**38**	**Continuous increase**		
2000:		75		
2001:		N/A		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage reporting curriculum and instruction, professional development, and assessments aligned				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	No data available			
1999:	**26**	**Continuous increase**		
2000:		50		
2001:		N/A		

OBJECTIVE 3: PROMOTE EXCELLENT TEACHING THAT WILL ENABLE ALL STUDENTS TO REACH CHALLENGING STATE AND/OR LOCAL STANDARDS.

Indicator 3.1 Teachers' knowledge of standards: Increasing percentages of teachers will report that they feel very well prepared to implement state or district content and performance standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data reported, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation & Qualifications of Public School Teachers, 1999.
1998:	38%			*Frequency:* Biennially.
1999:	**No data available**	**Continuous increase**	**Explanation:** Data is collected from a biennial survey. As increasing numbers of states have content and performance standards in place for longer periods of time, it is expected that teacher preparedness to teach to these standards will increase.	*Next Update:* 2001 for 2000.
2000:		50%		**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES statistical standards.
2001:		Continuous increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data is self-reported data.

OBJECTIVE 4: PROMOTE PARENTAL AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN STUDENT LEARNING THROUGH THE PARENT INFORMATION AND RESOURCE ASSISTANCE CENTERS (PIRCS).

Indicator 4.1 Parent Information Resource Centers beneficiaries: Parents will report that they are more knowledgeable about education issues after receiving information and services from the PIRCS.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Parents reporting increased knowledge about education issues			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Planned national evaluation.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Planned.
1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**	**Explanation:** The program is expected to be reauthorized with the ESEA. The Department has proposed evaluation activities and requested funds for national activities that could be used for evaluation. Data for this indicator would be collected through the planned evaluation.	*Next Update:* Planned.
2000:	Baseline to be established	N/A		**Validation Procedure:** N/A.
2001:		Baseline to be established		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** N/A.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Provide assistance at the state and school levels for improved school performance and increased family and community engagement in learning, through Department service teams, technical assistance centers, and state school support teams.
- Support interstate working groups to discuss how to improve and measure student achievement and to identify the types of Goal 2000 activities that support gains in student achievement.
- Encourage states and districts to share their model standards as they relate to the reading, math, and college preparation initiatives.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Expand public understanding of the need for challenging academic standards by disseminating information on standards-based reform through states, national associations, and other stakeholders.
- Help states and districts develop and implement aligned assessments designed to improve student learning by providing financial support under Goals 2000 and Title I and by encouraging the sharing of effective methodologies.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Convene state cluster meetings to evaluate program effectiveness, systemic cross-program planning, and opportunities to sustain reform initiatives.
- Conduct evaluations of systemic, standards-based reform efforts within states, local districts, and schools and its impact on student achievement.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Goals 2000 grants and subgrants require states and LEAs to develop a comprehensive school reform plan that aligns all local, state, and federal programs with state learning goals. In most states this comprehensive plan serves as a foundation for the consolidated plans required under the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA. Consequently, Goals 2000 is intimately connected with the alignment of all ESEA programs with each other. Goals 2000 activities have been most closely aligned with ESEA Title I reform efforts (standards, assessments, accountability, schoolwides, CSRD, etc.), Parent Information and Resource Centers, Comprehensive Assistance Centers, and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF). Initial Goals 2000 grants to states included funds for technology planning; those plans became the foundation for TLCF activities.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- States have varying levels of commitment to systemic standards-based reform. Thus, their definition and approach to systemic reform varies considerably.
- States are at varying stages in their development of standards and aligned assessment systems.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- FY 1999 Indicator 1.1 was changed in FY 2000 to focus exclusively on NAEP and targets were refined to be more specific.
- FY 1999 Indicator 1.2 was changed in FY 2000 to be more specific.
- FY 1999 Indicator 2.2 was changed to better align with ESEA Title I and became Indicator 2.1 in FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 2.3 was changed to better align with ESEA Title I and became Indicator 2.2 in FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 3.4 was made more specific and became Indicator 3.1.
- FY 1999 Indicator 4.1 was changed in FY 2000 to better align with an ongoing data source.
- FY 1999 Indicator 4.2 became Indicator 2.3 in FY in 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 4.3 referred to the numbers of teachers; in FY 2000 the reference was changed to the percentage of teachers.
- FY 1999 Indicator 5.1 was made more specific in FY 2000.

Dropped

- FY 1999 Indicators 2.1 and 2.4 were dropped in FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicators 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 were dropped in FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 5.2 was dropped in FY 2000.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- The order of Indicators 3 and Indicators 4 was switched.
- Indicator 1.1 (formerly Indicator 1.2—meeting or exceeding state performance standards: by 2002, 32 states with 2 years of assessment data and aligned standards and assessments will report an increase in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficient and advanced levels in reading and math on their state assessment systems) was changed as follows: (a) the 2002 date was dropped from the indicator because the program will not be funded beyond FY 2000; (b) the unit of analysis was changed to states and districts that have implemented systemic, standards-based reform, which is a better measure of the fidelity of implementation of Goals 2000 than 2 years of assessment data with aligned assessments; (c) the word "report" was changed to "show" (d) the measure was simplified to the percentage meeting or exceeding proficient levels rather than proficient and advanced levels, and (e) state assessment systems was simplified to state assessments.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1 (standards for core subjects: increasing numbers of states will have content and performance standards in place in reading and math. By 2000, all states will have content and performance standards in place) was changed so that it no longer addresses time periods before 2000.
- Indicator 2.2 (aligned assessments: increasing numbers of states will have assessments aligned to content and performance standards for two core subjects. By 2000, 40 states will have aligned assessments; by 2001, all will) was changed to better align with the Title I legislation.
- Indicator 4.1 (formerly Indicator 3.1—PAT/HIPPY participation the number of families who participate in Parents as Teachers (PAT) or Home Instruction for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY), will increase annually. By 2000, approximately 14,000 families will participate in PAT or HIPPY was changed to better measure impact.
- Indicator 3.1 (formerly Indicator 4.1—teachers' knowledge of standards) was modified so that the wording is better aligned with the survey question used to gather performance data.

Dropped

- Former Indicator 1.1 (shared indicator on student performance on national assessments: Between 1992 and 2002, the percentages of students who meet basic, proficient, and advanced levels in reading and math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress will increase) was dropped. This indicator was dropped because it is too broad to measure the impact of Goals 2000; the impact of Goals 2000 depends to some extent on the degree of implementation at the state level and on the support for implementing systemic, standards-based reform given to districts, both of which has been uneven nationally.
- Indicator 4.2 (professional development: the percentage of teachers who indicate that they are engaged in professional development that is enabling them to teach to challenging standards will increase annually. By 2000, 50 percent of teachers will report such participation) was deleted as Indicator 4.1 sufficiently captures the construct measured by this indicator.
- Indicator 5.1 (satisfaction with Goals 2000 administration: Increasing percentages of Goals 2000 customers (e.g., SEA and LEA staff) report that the technical assistance provided by federal Goals 2000 staff is of high quality, useful, and meets their needs) will be retained for internal management purposes but was removed from this performance plan.

New—None.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK OPPORTUNITIES

Goal: To build School-to-Work (STW) systems that increase student academic achievement, improve technical skills, and broaden career opportunities for all.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: All objectives in this table support the Department's Strategic Plan Objective 1.2 (schools help all students make successful transitions to college and careers.)
FY 2000—$55,000,000
FY 2001—$0 (Program scheduled to be terminated)

OBJECTIVE 1: ALL YOUTH—INCLUDING THOSE WHO ARE DISADVANTAGED, HAVE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY, ARE ACADEMICALLY GIFTED, ARE OUT OF SCHOOL, OR ARE DISABLED—HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ENGAGE ACTIVELY IN SCHOOL-TO-WORK SYSTEMS.

Indicator 1.1 Student Participation in STW Systems: By fall 2000, one million youth will be participating in STW systems. Participation is defined as receiving an integrated academic and occupational curriculum and completing a related work-based learning experience.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of students that participated in STW systems

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996:	280,000	
1997:	471,000	
1998:	515,617	
1999:	**No data available**	**750,000***
2000:		1,000,000*
2001:		See note**

*Original performance targets set for this indicator were 1,000,000 students in 1999 and 2,000,000 students in 2000. Those targets were based on a less rigorous definition of STW participation than is now used as a basis for measuring progress. Changes in performance targets reflect more reasonable and appropriate expectations of student involvement given the more rigorous definition.

**Performance targets were set only through the year 2000. This is due to the scheduled sunset of the STW legislation in 2001, with final data collection at that time reflecting previous year's performance.

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data; trend toward target is likely.

Explanation: Performance targets are likely to be met, given a significant investment by the National STW Office in providing technical assistance to help states develop more intensive workplace learning experiences that connect to student's academic and technical coursework in school. Performance targets are also likely to be met given the steady increase in the number of students participating in STW and the change to more reasonable and appropriate performance targets.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Progress Measures Survey.
Frequency: Annually
Next Update: 2000 (for 1999 data)

Validation Procedure: Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, data from other sources, including the national STW evaluation, corroborate these findings.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: This survey is voluntary and collects data only from substate-funded, local partnerships. As the Federal investment in state STW initiatives ends—beginning in 1999 with the first eight states that were funded in 1994—fewer local partnerships will be funded and have the resources required to gather and submit data.

OBJECTIVE 2: ALL YOUTH EARN A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA OR EQUIVALENCY, MEET CHALLENGING ACADEMIC STANDARDS, HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO RECEIVE A SKILL CERTIFICATE, AND ARE PREPARED FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND CAREERS.

Indicator 2.1 Academic achievement: By fall 2000, 80 percent of high school graduates (including vocational concentrators) in STW systems will complete at least 3 years each of math and science.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of students who took at least 3 years each of mathematics and science					**Status:** It is likely that performance targets for 2000 will be met. **Explanation:** Performance targets are likely to be met, given the growing number of states that are requiring all students—including those that participate in STW activities—to take more rigorous academic courses to meet graduation requirements.	**Source:** National STW Evaluation, Student Transcripts of High School Seniors in Eight States. *Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* 2001 (for 2000 data). **Validation Procedure:** Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No data limitations are noted.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Math	Science	Both			
1996:	83%	73%	69%			
1998:	85%	78%	74%			
1999:	**No data available**			**Continuous improvement**		
2000:				80%		
2001:				See second note under Indicator 1.1		

Indicator 2.2 Transition from high school: By fall 2000, 92 percent of high school graduates in STW systems will successfully transition into either further education, employment, or the military.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of high school graduates in STW systems that successfully transitioned into either college, employment, or the military						**Status:** It is likely that performance targets for 2000 will be met. **Explanation:** Performance targets for 1999-01 are likely to be met, given the steady increase in students taking more rigorous courses (see Indicator 2.1) in preparation for college and careers.	**Source:** National STW Evaluation, follow-up Survey of High School Seniors in Eight States. *Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* 2000 (for 1998 data). **Validation Procedure:** Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No data limitations are noted.
Year	**Actual Performance**				**Performance Targets**		
	College	Employment	Military	Total			
1996:	60%	7%	20%	87%			
1998:	Data to become available in spring 2000						
1999:	**No data available**				**Continuous improvement**		
2000:					92%		
2001:					**See second note under Indicator 1.1		

Indicator 2.3 Skill Certificates: By fall 2000, 10 percent of students in STW systems will earn skill certificates.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of seniors who received skill certificates			**Status:** Progress is expected, but it is unlikely that performance targets for 1999-00 will be met. **Explanation:** Improvement is expected as a result of a significant investment by the National STW Office in providing technical assistance and resources to help states develop career major programs that lead to the awarding of skill certificates.	**Source:** National STW Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (for 1999 data). **Validation Procedure:** Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This survey is voluntary and collects data only from substate-funded, local partnerships. As the Federal investment in state STW initiatives ends—beginning in 1999 with the first eight states that were funded in 1994—fewer local partnerships will be funded and have the resources required to gather and submit data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996:	2.4%			
1997:	3.6%			
1998:	4.2%			
1999:	**No data available**	**7%**		
2000:		10%		
2001:		See note under Indicator 1.1		

OBJECTIVE 3: BUILD COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL-TO-WORK SYSTEMS IN EVERY STATE.

Indicator 3.1 High Schools: An increasing percentage of high schools will have implemented key STW components. Implementation of key STW components are defined as offering career major programs that require an extended workplace activity.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of high schools that implemented key STW components			**Status:** Progress is expected, but it is unlikely that performance targets for 1999-00 will be met. **Explanation:** Improvement is expected as a result of a significant investment by the National STW Office in providing technical assistance and resources to help states develop career majors programs.	**Source:** National STW Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (for 1999 data). **Validation Procedure:** Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** See note under Indicator 2.3.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996:	25%			
1998:	25%			
1999:	**No data available**	**35%**		
2000:		40%		
2001:		See second note under Indicator 1.1		

Indicator 3.2 Community and Technical Colleges: An increasing percent of community and technical colleges will have articulation agreements with high schools to grant academic credit for work-based learning.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of colleges developing articulation agreements with high schools			**Status:** Progress is expected, but it is unlikely that performance targets for 1999-00 will be met.	**Source:** National STW Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually
1996:	21%			*Next Update:* 2000 (for 1999 data)
1997:	18%		**Explanation:** While the percentage of articulation agreements continues to grow, performance targets are unlikely to be met, given past trends. This may be due in part to the lack of an early investment and strategy in brokering relationships among community/technical colleges and schools and postsecondary institutions. It is likely, however, that given several recent national investments that the percentage of community/technical colleges having articulation agreements with high schools will continue to rise.	**Validation Procedure:** Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings.
1998:	20%			
1999:	**No data available**	**33%**		
2000:		40%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** See note under Indicator 2.3 above.
2001:		See second note under Indicator 1.1		

Indicator 3.3 Employers providing work-based learning opportunities: By fall 2000, 350,000 employers will be providing work-based learning experiences for students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of employers providing students with work-based learning experiences			**Status:** Significant progress is expected, but it is uncertain that performance targets for 1999-01 will be met.	**Source:** Progress Measures Survey.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1996:	59,000			*Next Update:* 1999.
1997:	136,000		**Explanation:** Improvement is expected as a result of a significant investment by the National STW Office in providing technical assistance and resources—through employer and labor intermediary organizations—to substantially increase the number of employers providing work-based learning experiences for students. Moreover, current upward economic trends are likely to continue to increase labor demand and, in turn, the extent to which employers use STW as an opportunity to be involved in the training of their future workforce.	**Validation Procedure:** Data were collected before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. However, other sources of data corroborate these findings.
1998:	109,251			
1999:	**No data available**	**270,000**		
2000:		350,000		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** See note under Indicator 1.1 above.
2001:		See second note under Indicator 1.1		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Providing technical assistance and resources to help grantees develop and sustain STW systems. Assistance includes sponsoring a national information center, hosting intensive STW system-building institutes, identifying exemplary STW models and promising practices, and helping to identify sources of support for states to sustain their STW systems after the Federal legislation sunsets in 2001.
- Providing leadership for strategies that support state and local STW system-building, such as integrating curriculum and linking work-based learning with school-based learning; aligning postsecondary admissions policies with new methods of assessing high school student performance, and increasing the ability of teachers to use STW approaches in their instructional methods.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Providing grants to employer and labor intermediary organizations to increase the number of employers providing intensive, work-based learning opportunities that are connected to students' academic and technical coursework.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The National STW Office is under the joint administration of the Departments of Education and Labor (through the Offices of Vocational and Adult Education and Employment and Training Administration, respectively).
- In conducting research activities, the National STW Office collaborates with the Employment and Training Administration, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and the Office of the Undersecretary's Planning and Evaluation Service.
- In conducting STW system-building activities, the National STW Office works with DOL's Office of Youth Opportunities, Job Corps, and the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.
- In developing career major programs, the National STW Office works with the Departments of Transportation and Treasury.
- Beginning in calendar 2000, STW will collaborate with the President's Council on Youth with Disabilities and the Social Security Administration on a project to increase access to STW activities for youth with disabilities.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The lack of a targeted Federal investment in STW initiatives after the scheduled sunset of the legislation in 2001 will interrupt the momentum of states and localities in developing and implementing their STW systems.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.2 was strengthened by including data on student transitions into employment and the military.
- Indicator 4.1 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.1.
- Indicator 4.2 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.2.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2 was dropped because of low item response on a survey designated to gather this information.
- Indicator 2.1 was dropped as it is already captured in both this year's Indicators 2.1 and 2.2.
- Indicator 2.4 was dropped because of low item response on a survey designated to gather this information.
- Indicator 3.1 was dropped pending identification of a valid and reliable data source.
- Indicator 3.2 was dropped because it was determined to be a system output measure rather than a student outcome measure.
- Objective 4 was dropped because it was determined to be already captured in Objective 3.
- Objective 5 was dropped because it was determined to be already captured in Objective 3.
- Indicator 5.1 was dropped because it was determined to be a system output measure, rather than a student outcome measure.
- Objective 6 and Indicators 6.1 and 6.2 were dropped because they were determined to be system output measures rather than student outcome measures.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 3.2 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.1.
- Indicator 3.3 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.2.
- Indicator 3.4 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 3.3.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.4 was dropped because of low item response on a survey designated to gather this information.
- Indicator 3.1 was dropped because it was determined to be a system output measure, rather than a student outcome measure.
- Indicators 2.4 and 1.2 were dropped because they were determined to be system output measures rather than student outcome measures.

New—None.

EDUCATION FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

TITLE I GRANTS FOR SCHOOLS SERVING AT-RISK CHILDREN

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Title I supports Objectives 2.1 (ready-to-learn), 2.2 (reads by third grade), 2.3 (masters mathematics by eighth grade), and 2.4 (service to special populations) of the Department's strategic plan by funding services to enable at-risk students in low-income communities to meet challenging academic standards. It also helps build the capacity of schools in low-income communities to improve their performance through supporting standards and assessment development (Objective 1.1), staff professional development (Objective 1.4), family involvement (Objective 1.5), and technology (Objective 1.7).

FY 2000—$7,996,020,000

FY 2001—$8,357,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PERFORMANCE OF THE LOWEST-ACHIEVING STUDENTS AND STUDENTS IN HIGH-POVERTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS WILL INCREASE SUBSTANTIALLY IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.

Indicator 1.1 Student performance on national assessments: Performance of the lowest-achieving public school students and students in high-poverty public schools will increase substantially on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data

NAEP reading scale scores for public school students at the bottom 25th percentile

Year	4th Grade		8th Grade		12th Grade	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994	187		234		263	
1998	192		239		266	
1999:	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement
2002		202		249		276

NAEP Mathematics Scale Scores for Public School Students at the Bottom 25th Percentile

Year	4th Grade		8th Grade		12th Grade	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1992	197		242		274	
1996	201		247		281	
1999:	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement	No data available	Continuous improvement
2000		211		257		291

Assessment of Progress

Status: Positive movement toward the target for students at the bottom 25th percentile.

Explanation: Data are based on NAEP, which is collected every 4 years. The most recent NAEP show that students at the bottom 25th percentile had increasing scores in both reading and math at all three grade levels over the 4-year period (from 1994 to 1998 for reading and from 1992 to 1996 for math). Average scale scores rose by between 3 and 7 points, depending on the subject and grade level, with an average increase of about 5 points. However, the rate of growth will need to accelerate in order to meet the targets for 2000 and 2002, which will require a 10-point increase in average scale scores for each subject at each grade level. A 10-point increase is roughly equivalent to one grade level.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), reading.
Frequency: Every 4 years.
Next Update: 2002.

Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), mathematics.
Frequency: Every 4 years.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: NAEP assessments are not aligned with state content and performance standards. Caution is suggested in interpreting 12th grade achievement data because Title I serves a small number of high school students.

Targets and Performance Data				
Percentage of fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools at or above basic level in reading				
Year	**50-100% Poverty**		**75-100% Poverty**	
	Actual Performance	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1994:	36%		26%	
1998:	43%		32%	
1999:	**No data available**	**Continuous Improvement**	**No data available**	**Continuous Improvement**
2002:		60%		50%
Percentage of fourth grade students in high-poverty schools at or above basic level in mathematics				
Year	**50-100% Poverty**		**75-100% Poverty**	
	Actual Performance	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1992:	31%		26%	
1996:	49%		42%	
1999:	**No data available**	**Continuous improvement**	**No data available**	**Continuous improvement**
2000:		60%		50%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Positive movement for students in high-poverty schools.

Explanation: Fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools were more likely to score at or above the basic level in both reading and math. For schools above 50 percent poverty, the percentage of students at or above the basic level in reading rose from 36 percent in 1994 to 43 percent in 1998; in math the percentage rose from 31 percent in 1992 to 49 percent in 1996. For the highest-poverty schools (those above 75 percent poverty), the percentage of students at or above the basic level in reading rose from 26 percent in 1994 to 32 percent in 1998, and in math rose from 26 percent in 1992 to 42 percent in 1996.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), reading.
Frequency: Every 4 years.
Next Update: 2002.

Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), mathematics.
Frequency: Every 4 years.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES statistical standards.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: NAEP assessments are not aligned with state content and performance standards.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indicator 1.2 Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: Among states with 2 years of assessment data and aligned content and performance standards, an increasing number will report an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50 percent poverty who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math on their state assessment systems.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of states with performance standards aligned to content standards and two years of data disaggregated by school poverty level

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	10	
1998:	11	
1999:	**No data available**	**15**
2000:		20
2001:		24
2002:		26

Number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50 percent poverty who meet proficient and advanced levels of performance

Year	Reading		Mathematics		Both	
	Actual	Targets	Actual	Targets	Actual	Targets
1997:	7		7		7	
1998:	10		10		10	
1999:	**No data**	**13**	**No data**	**13**	**No data**	**13**
2000:		18		18		18
2001:		20		20		20
2002:		24		24		24

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data but progress toward the target is likely. Data for the 1998-99 school year will become available in fall 2000.

Explanation: Although the number of states with aligned performance standards and 2 years of data disaggregated by school poverty level rose only slightly between 1997 and 1998, the rate of increase is expected to accelerate as the 2001 deadline approaches for state reporting of disaggregated results.

While all states are required to have disaggregated data, not all states are likely to have 2 years of achievement data from their final aligned assessment system for reporting in the 2001-02 school year.

The number of states that reported an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50 percent poverty who met proficient and advanced levels of performance in both reading and mathematics rose from 7 states in 1997 to 10 states in 1998. All but one of the states with the necessary assessment data reported increased achievement in their high-poverty schools.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Title I state performance reports.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 1999.

Validation Procedure: Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There is substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance as well as alignment of content and performance standards. All states are in the transitional period for final assessments and accountability systems. The first peer review of state final assessment systems will take place in January 2000. All states will be required to submit evidence of their final aligned assessments by October 2000.

Indicator 1.3 Improving schools: An increasing percentage of Title I schools will report that they have met or exceeded state or district standards for progress.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. Data for the 1998-99 school year will become available (fall 2000).	**Source:** Follow-Up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98. *Frequency:* One time. *Next Update:* None.
1998:	57%			
1999:	**No data available**	**75%**	**Explanation:** Unable to assess progress until the 1999 data become available (fall 2000).	**Source:** Annual Title I State Performance Reports, SY 1998-99 and beyond. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Fall 2000.
2000:		85%		
2001:		90%		**Validation Procedure:** Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There is substantial variation across states in their definitions of adequate yearly progress and proficient student performance.

Indicator 1.4 School readiness of Title I participants: An increasing percentage of children in Title I preschool programs will achieve a basic level of readiness on measures of language development, reading readiness, and mathematics concepts.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Planned Title I Preschool Evaluation. *Frequency:* Biannually. *Next Update:* 2001.
1999:	**No data available**	**To be established after baseline data are obtained**	**Explanation:** New indicator.	
2000:				
2001:				**Validation Procedure:** Data are not yet available.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Limitations unknown—study is in the design phase.

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF TITLE I SCHOOLS USING STANDARDS-BASED REFORM AND EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES TO ENABLE ALL STUDENTS TO REACH STATE AND LOCAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

Indicator 2.1 Use of challenging standards: All Title I schools will report the use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of schools reporting use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in reading and math "to a great extent"					**Status:** Positive movement toward the target in both reading and math.	**Source:** Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98. *Frequency:* One time. *Next Update:* None.
Year	**Reading**		**Mathematics**		**Explanation:** The percentage of schools reporting use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction in reading "to a great extent" rose from 74 percent in 1997-98 (based on principals' responses) to 81 percent in 1998-99 (based on teachers' responses) but did not reach the target of 85 percent. For math, the percentage of schools reporting use of standards to guide curriculum and instruction "to a great extent" rose from 73 percent in 1997-98 to 78 percent in 1998-99 but did not reach the target of 85 percent.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through SY 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
	Actual Performance	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	74%		73%			
1999:	**81%**	**85%**	**78%**	**85%**		
2000:		100%		100%		
2001:		100%		100%		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data for 1998 were based on a survey of principals, while data for 1999 were based on a teacher survey. Teachers are a more valid source of information on classroom practices.

Indicator 2.2 Extended learning time: An increasing number of Title I schools will operate before- and after-school, summer, or other programs to extend and reinforce student learning.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of Title I schools operating extended learning time programs either during the school year or during the summer

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998:	65%	
1999:	**83%**	**70%**
2000:		75%
2001:		80%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded.

Explanation: The percentage of Title I schools reporting that they offered extended time programs rose from 65 percent in 1997-98 to 83 percent in 1998-99. However, much of this increase is probably due to a change in the wording of the questionnaire, which included only instructional programs in 1997-98 but included all extended time programs in 1998-99, including non-instructional programs such as after-school daycare.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98.
Frequency: One time.
Next Update: None.

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The 1997-98 survey asked about instructional extended time programs, while the 1998-99 survey asked about extended time programs generally and included daycare and other non-instructional programs. The survey will be revised for the 2000-01 school year to focus again on instructional programs only.

Indicator 2.3 Parental involvement for improved student performance: An increasing percentage of Title I schools will report that their parental involvement programs and activities are effective in improving student performance.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of teachers in Title I schools reporting that their school's parent involvement efforts have resulted in a "great extent" of change in their classroom

Year	Students Attending School Regularly		Students Arriving at School on Time		Homework Completion	
1999:	**70%**	**Baseline**	**67%**	**Baseline**	**43%**	**Baseline**
2000:		90%		90%		90%
2001:		90%		90%		90%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge.

Explanation: Baseline data for the 1998-99 school year show that two-thirds of the teachers in Title I schools report that their school's parent involvement efforts resulted in a "great extent" of change in students attending school regularly (70 percent) and students arriving at school on time (67 percent). A smaller percentage of these teachers reported that parent involvement efforts had greatly improved homework completion (43 percent).

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 and 2000-01.
Frequency: Biennially.
Next Update: 2001.

Validation Procedure: Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No known limitations.

Indicator 2.4 Qualified staff: Title I schools will report an increase in the proportion of Title I staff who are teachers and in district support for the educational improvement of paraprofessionals.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Title I staff who are teachers **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** 1998 / 45% **1999:** / **45%** / **No target set** 2000: / / 47% 2001: / / 49%	**Status:** No change. **Explanation:** The percentage of Title I-funded staff who are teachers was unchanged from SY 1997-98 to SY 1998-99. Currently, the program supports as many teacher aides as teachers, and there is concern that many of these aides are performing instructional responsibilities for which they are not qualified. An increase in the proportion of Title I staff who are teachers would reflect a shift in using Title I funds for staff who are more qualified to help students improve their achievement levels.	**Source:** Study of Education Resources and Federal Funding, SY 1997-98. *Frequency:* One time. *Next Update:* None. **Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Additional information is needed on the qualifications of teachers and the extent to which Title I teacher aides are providing instruction to students, a responsibility that is inappropriate for the education and training of most paraprofessionals. Future surveys will obtain information on these issues.
Percentage of Title I schools in districts offering career ladders for paraprofessionals **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** 1998: / 24% **1999:** / **30%** / **30%** 2000: / / 35% 2001: / / 35%	**Status:** Target met. **Explanation:** The percentage of Title I schools whose districts offer career ladders rose from 24 percent in 1997-98 to 30 percent in 1998-99.	**Source:** Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, SY 1997-98. *Frequency:* One time. *Next Update:* None. **Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed, but not reported until 2000. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No known limitations.

OBJECTIVE 3: STATES AND DISTRICTS WILL IMPLEMENT STANDARDS-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS AND PROVIDE EFFECTIVE SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS.

Indicator 3.1 Establishing annual progress measures: All states will adopt or develop measures of adequate yearly progress linked to state performance standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Title I peer review records. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		
2000:		40 states		
2001:		All states	**Explanation:** All states have adopted transitional measures of adequate yearly progress and will be adopting final measures of adequate yearly progress linked to state performance as they put their final assessments in place (see Indicator 3.2). All states are in the transitional period for final assessments and accountability systems. The first peer review of state final assessment systems will take place beginning in January 2000. All states will be required to submit evidence of their final aligned assessments by October 2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by independent contractors who reviewed state plans. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No known limitations.

Indicator 3.2 Aligned assessments: All states will have assessments aligned with content and performance standards for mathematics, and reading or language arts.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Title I peer review records. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**N/A**	**N/A**		
2000:		40 states		
2001:		All states	**Explanation:** Although no states have yet submitted evidence to the Department that they have final assessments in place, an independent evaluation found that 14 states had assessments aligned to state standards in 1997. All states are in the transitional period for final assessments and accountability systems. The first peer review of state final assessment systems will take place beginning in January 2000. All states will be required to submit evidence of their final aligned assessments by October 2000. The Department distributed peer review guidance for aligned assessments in fall 1999 and conducted technical workshops for states. The Department has recently identified 15 states as having a high-priority need for assistance and intervention if they are to have a final aligned assessment system in place within the statutory timeline.	**Validation Procedure:** Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No known limitations. By design and by the legislation, Title I peer review records are the authoritative data source for this indicator.

Indicator 3.3 Effective assistance and public school enrollment options: Schools identified as needing improvement will report receiving effective assistance from their districts and states, including expanded opportunities for children to transfer to high-performing public schools.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of schools identified for improvement that report receiving assistance as a result of being identified			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Prior evaluations indicate that states and districts may lack the capacity to provide effective support for school improvement. In 1998, the Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform indicated that only eight states reported that school support teams were able to serve the majority of schools identified as in need of improvement. In 24 states, Title I directors reported more schools in need of assistance than Title I could support. Among schools that reported in 1997-98 that they had been identified for improvement, only 47 percent reported that they had received additional professional development or assistance from school support teams. Future evaluations will track progress in providing more effective assistance from the perspective of the schools in need of this assistance.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1998-99 through 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Schools were asked about whether they received assistance but not about the quality of that assistance. Future surveys will ask schools about the effectiveness of the assistance they received.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**47%**	**Baseline**		
2000:		60%		
2001:		80%		
Percentage of schools reporting expanded opportunities for children to transfer to public schools not identified for improvement			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Indicator has been expanded to include performance data concerning public school choice opportunities for children attending Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, consistent with the FY 2000 appropriations language concerning Title I school improvement funds.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1999-00 and 2000-01. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before Department Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The number of sample schools responding to this survey item is very small because the question was asked only of schools that had been identified as in need of improvement for more than 1 year.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Targets will be set after baseline data are obtained for school year 1999-00		
2001:		To be established after the baseline data are obtained		

Indicator 3.4 Schools identified for improvement: An increasing percentage of schools identified for improvement will make sufficient progress to move out of school improvement status.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, SY 1999-00. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**No data available**	**Targets will be set after baseline data are obtained**	**Explanation:** This is a new indicator, needed to assess whether Title I schools identified as in need of improvement actually do improve. States report annually on the number of schools identified for improvement but do not report the number of schools that move out of school improvement status each year. The Department will amend the annual Consolidated State Performance Report to obtain this information, beginning with the 2001-01 school year. For the 1999-00 school year, data will be obtained from the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools.	**Source**: Consolidated State Performance Report, SY 2000-01 and beyond. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure**: N/A. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No known limitations.
2000:				
2001:				

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Continue collaborating with professional organizations, providing technical assistance, and disseminating descriptions of successful extended-time and research-based practice and programs to promote school-level improvement.
- Continue to assist states as they develop and implement challenging, aligned systems of standards, assessments, and accountability.
- Continue the support for increased parent and family involvement.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Disseminate the findings from the National Research Council's reports, "Preventing Reading Difficulties," and "Starting Out Right" to all Title I Coordinators and to all Title I teachers. Use integrated review teams' follow-up stage to determine whether Title I teachers are using the research-based reading practices described in the reports in their classrooms.
- Disseminate new "Compact for Reading" guide to help parents and other caregivers reinforce reading instruction.
- Assist states and high-poverty school districts in the development, implementation, and refinement of aligned systems of standards, assessments, and accountability.
- Provide expert peer consultants and target technical assistance and dissemination efforts about standards, assessments, and accountability to those states and school systems that have the greatest need for assistance.
- Sponsor national, regional, and statewide forums that focus on moving content standards into the classroom, particularly in high-poverty schools.
- Work with Comprehensive Centers and Regional Labs to develop, disseminate, and demonstrate various approaches to transform state content standards into everyday teaching practice in Title I high-poverty schools across the nation.
- Disseminate research-based and promising practices of effective implementation of Title I provisions in order to accelerate the progress of districts and schools toward better student achievement, particularly in high-poverty and low-performing states, districts, and schools.
- Disseminate to all state and local education agencies guidance about how to use Title I and other Federal program funds to support extended learning time programs.
- Initiate a study of the programs, policies, and practices in districts that provide good career development opportunities for teacher aides.
- Initiate studies that focus on implementation challenges and successes associated with aligned standards, assessment, and accountability systems.
- Invite nationally recognized experts to work with Title I and Comprehensive Center staff to design a Resource Guide for aligning curricula to standards.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- To assist state educational agencies in meeting timelines for final aligned assessment and accountability systems, the Compensatory Education Program office is leading the effort to provide ED and peer expert assistance, in collaboration with the Goals 2000 Program office and the OESE Standards, Assessment, and Accountability team. The Department has produced guidance for peer reviewers of states' evidence of such systems, has conducted orientation sessions for state agency teams, and continues to make available expert Peer Consultants to all states, paying particular attention to those states that may not meet the timelines as required by the Title I statute.
- To assess the impact of Title I preschool literacy programs in preparing at-risk children for success in kindergarten, a study is being designed for such purpose in collaboration with the Department's office of Planning and Evaluation Services, and the Even Start and Head Start programs, which are administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- While states, districts, and schools encounter many challenges in having at-risk students meet challenging standards, the following challenges comprise the "short" list outlined in the final report of the National assessment of Title I, Promising Results, Continuing Challenges. These challenges are also addressed in the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of Title I of the ESEA as well as in the program's new or strengthened strategies listed above.
- The challenges include
  - closing the achievement gap,
  - strengthening instruction,
  - focusing on assistance and accountability, and
  - strengthening parental involvement.
- Other challenges include
  - high turnover of state and local Title I Directors,
  - ED concern for 15 states that may not have final aligned state assessment systems within established timelines, and
  - professional development programs for teachers in Title I schools that are of sufficient breadth and depth to improve teaching and learning.
- Although the NAEP data indicate that students at the bottom 25th percentile showed increasing scores in both reading and math at all three grade levels, the rate of growth will need to accelerate in order to meet the targets for 2000 and 2002. Strategies to close the achievement gap and to accelerate the rate of improved performance include:
  - moving research-based teaching strategies and best/promising practice into more high-poverty schools;
  - assisting states and school districts in the development, implementation and refinement of aligned systems of standards, assessments, and accountability;
  - disseminating abstracts of successful extended-time programs—supported by Title I as well as other Federal, state, and local funds—to schools with poverty rates of at least 50 percent;
  - increasing the number of qualified staff providing instruction in Title I schools, while decreasing the number of Title I paraprofessionals who provide direct instruction to students through the "bully pulpit" at national, regional, and state meetings;
  - continuing to request Federal funding for the necessary support systems administered by the state education agencies for the benefit of low-performing schools and high-poverty schools; and
  - strengthening parental involvement in the early grades to support reading and family literacy, and in the middle- and high-school levels to encourage students to take challenging courses.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- FY 1999 Indicator 1.1 (state and local assessments) was modified for FY 2000. The FY 2000 indicator remains unchanged in FY 2001, except for its indicator number, which is described above.
- FY 1999 Indicator 1.2 (NAEP reading and math) was modified for FY 2000 to target performance of the lowest achieving students and students in the highest-poverty public schools as well as being renumbered as Indicator 1.1 (a shared indicator with Goals 2000). The FY 2001 indicator remains the same as FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 1.3 (other national tests) was dropped in FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 2.1 (recognition for quality) was dropped in FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 2.2 (standards and assessments) was modified by dropping the assessment indicator and including the standards section in FY 2000 Indicator 2.1 (use of challenging standards).
- FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) brings back the FY 1999 assessment piece that had been dropped in FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 2.3 (research-based curriculum and instruction) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.4.
- FY 1999 Indicator 2.4 (extended learning time) was slightly modified in FY 2000 and renumbered as Indicator 2.3.
- FY 1999 Indicator 2.5 (services to private school students) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.7 to delete "more effective communication, consultation, and services" and substitute "effective implementation of on-site services to students." For FY 2001, the indicator has been dropped as described above.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

Adjusted

- FY 1999 Indicator 3.1 (teacher training linked to standards) was dropped in FY 2000.
- FY 1999 Indicator 3.2 (qualified teacher aides) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.6 to shift the focus from credentials to district support for the educational improvement through career ladders for paraprofessionals and aides. FY 2001 Indicator 2.5 retains the FY 2000 indicator and expands to include qualified staff in Title I schools.
- FY 1999 Indicator 4.1 (implementing high standards) was slightly modified as FY 2000 Indicator 3.1 (establishing annual progress measures) and dropped in FY 2001.
- FY 1999 Indicator 4.2 (linked assessments) was modified slightly in FY 2000 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) and substantially maintained as FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments).
- FY 1999 Indicator 4.3 (accountability: monitoring, intervention, and assistance) was significantly changed in FY 2000 Indicator to assess only the provision of "effective assistance to schools not making progress through school support teams and other sources." The FY 2001 Indicator 3.3 remains the same as FY 2000 but has been expanded to include public school enrollment options as described above.
- FY 1999 Indicator 5.1 (school-parent compacts) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 to delete "school staff and parents will report" and replace it with "Title I participating schools will report." The FY 2001 Indicator 2.3 has been changed to reflect a broader assessment of the effectiveness of parental involvement programs.
- FY 1999 Indicator 5.2 (improved attendance and homework completion) was not included in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 but was used instead as performance data.
- FY 1999 Indicators 6.1 (responsive and useful guidance), 6.2 (impact on local understanding), and 6.3 (impact on local performance measurement) were indicators linked to Federal leadership, assistance and guidance objectives. All these indicators were dropped for FY 2000.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.2 (improving schools) is now Indicator 1.3 under Objective 1 (Student Performance) because it is more closely related to that than to reform strategies (Objective 2). It has been modified to delete the words "for two consecutive years."
- Indicator 2.3 (extended learning time) is now Indicator 2.2, which has been changed to include extended time offered either during the school year or during the summer and to extended any daycare and other non-instructional programs for the 2000-01 school year survey.
- Indicator 2.4 (research-based curriculum and instruction) has been dropped because of lack of quality data.
- Indicator 2.5 (school-parent compacts) is now Indicator 2.3, expanded to include broader parental involvement approaches to improve student performance.
- Indicator 2.6 (qualified teacher aides) is now Indicator 2.4 (qualified staff), which has been expanded to include the proportion of Title I staff who are teachers.
- Indicator 2.7 (services to private school students) has been dropped because the planned study was not conducted.
- Indicator 3.1 (establishing annual progress measures) has been revised to delete the wording "that are more rigorous than those used under the antecedent Chapter I program."
- Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) has been changed to delete "core subjects" and to replace these words with "mathematics and reading or language arts."
- Indicator 3.3 (aligned curricula and materials) has been dropped because of lack of data from surveys and studies.
- Indicator 3.4 (effective assistance) is now Indicator 3.3 and expanded to include public school enrollment options for students attending Title I schools that are [illegible]onically-low performing.

Dropped—None.

New

- Added new FY 2001 Indicator 1.4 (school readiness) to Objective 1.
- Added new FY 2001 Indicator 3.4 (schools identified for improvement)

EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAM

Goal: To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the Nation's low-income families, through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Even Start's activities support Objectives 2.1 (children enter school ready to learn), 2.2 (reading) and 3.4 (adult literacy) by providing model programs and supporting state and local implementation of the models. Because Even Start is focused on families most in need, it supports Objective 2.4 (special populations). A central feature of Even Start is its involvement of families and its coordination of community services to provide services to its families, supporting Objective 1.5 (families and communities).

FY 2000—$150,000,000

FY 2001—$150,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: THE LITERACY OF PARTICIPATING FAMILIES WILL IMPROVE.

Indicator 1.1 Adult literacy achievement: Increasing percentages of Even Start adults will achieve significant learning gains on measures of math and reading.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of adults showing moderate to large gains on Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)

	Math		Reading	
Year	**Actual**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**
1994-95:	26%		31%	
1995-96:	24%		20%	
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**
2000-01:		40%		30%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Math gains—no 1999 data are available, but significant progress toward target is unlikely. Reading gains—no 1999 data are available, but significant progress toward target is unlikely.

Explanation: The percentage of adults who showed significant gains in 1995-96 (the last year for which data are available) did not change in math and declined in reading. Progress toward the 1999 target was judged unlikely because of the trends in the Second National Evaluation and the challenges associated with long-term participation.

An improved but different assessment instrument will be used in the next measure of performance toward this target in 1999-00.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Second National Even Start Evaluation: sample study.
Frequency: Occasionally.
Next Update: Third National Even Start Evaluation: Experimental Design Study 1999-2000.

Validation Procedure: Data collection before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: *Limitations:* Study was designed to look at new participants' gains each year, thus the populations being compared in 1994-95 and 1995-96 were different. The sample study also had a small sample size, as well as grantee-collected data. *Planned Improvement:* The Third National Evaluation will use an experimental design, which is the strongest design for measuring program impact.

Indicator 1.2 Adult educational attainment: Increasing percentages of adult secondary education (ASE) Even Start participants will earn their high school diploma or equivalent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No significant progress toward target.	**Source:** Second National Even Start Evaluation: Universe Study.
1995-96:	18%*			*Frequency:* Annually.
1996-97:	19%*		**Explanation:** There has been no significant change in the percentage of ASE participants earning a Graduate Equivalency Diploma, and the challenges associated with long-term participation make significant progress unlikely. The 1998-99 figure was derived from only those participants with pre and post information, approximately one-fifth of all Even Start adults. The Revised Third National Evaluation instrument for 1999-00 will avoid this problem by asking all adult participants whether or not they obtained their Graduate Equivalency Diploma during the year.	*Next Update:* Third National Evaluation: Universe Study, 1999-00.
1998-99:	**18.4%****	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data Collection before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.
2000-01:		25%		
**Indicates the percentage of all adult secondary education Even Start participants who earned their high school diploma or Graduate Equivalency Diploma.*				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Definitions of participation in ASE and Graduate Equivalency Diploma may vary across programs, and these data are obtained through grantee self-report. Sample sizes and composition have varied but will be realigned in the 1999-2000 collection.
***Of the new enrollees who were working toward a high school diploma or Graduate Equivalency Diploma, the percentage who obtained a diploma or Graduate Equivalency Diploma by the end of the program year.*				

Indicator 1.3 Children's language development and reading readiness: Increasing percentages of Even Start children will achieve significant gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of children achieving moderate to large gains on a measure of language development			**Status:** Target met.	**Source:** Second National Even Start Evaluation: sample study.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** There has been a continuing increase in the percentage of children achieving gains on a measure of language development, an increase we can expect to continue.	*Frequency:* Occasionally.
1995-96:	45%			*Next Update:* Third National Even Start Evaluation: Experimental Design Study 1999-2000.
1996-97:	64%			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase	An improved but different assessment instrument will be used in the next measure of performance toward this target in 1999-2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Data Collection before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.
2000-01:		60%		
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: *Limitations:* Study was designed to look at new participants' gains each year; thus, the populations being compared in 1994-95 and 1995-96 were different. The sample study also had a small sample size, as well as grantee-collected data.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Planned Improvement: The Third National Evaluation will use an experimental design, which is the strongest design for measuring program impact. The new study will use measures that align for the most part with Head Start's national FACES study.

Indicator 1.4 Parenting skills: Increasing percentages of parents will show significant improvement on measures of parenting skills, home environment, and expectations for their children.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of parents of 3-to-6-year-old children making medium-to-large gains on the Home Screening Questionnaire			**Status:** No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Second National Even Start Evaluation: Universe Study.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1994-95:	41%		**Explanation:** The percentage of parents showing significant improvement on measures of parenting skills has continued to improve. ED has also placed a strong emphasis on improving the literacy focus of parenting education in the last year.	*Next Update:* Third National Evaluation: Universe Study and Experimental Design Study 1999-2000.
1995-96:	50%			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data Collection before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.
2000-01:		Continuing increase	The third national evaluation will use a different assessment instrument in the next measure of performance toward this target in 1999-00.	
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Instruments used to measure parenting outcomes often have accuracy problems; parents often respond with the answer that is socially acceptable, even if not accurate.

OBJECTIVE 2: EVEN START PROJECTS WILL REACH THEIR TARGET POPULATION OF FAMILIES WHO ARE MOST IN NEED OF SERVICES.

Indicator 2.1 Recruitment of most in need: The projects will continue to recruit low-income, disadvantaged families with low literacy levels.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of families having incomes at or substantially below the Federal poverty level at intake			**Status:** Target met.	**Source:** Second and Third National Even Start Evaluations: Universe Study.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Projects are already successfully targeting service to the neediest of families. No declines expected.	*Frequency:* Annually.
1996-97:	90%			*Next Update:* Third National Evaluation: universe study 1999-2000.
1998-99:	**85%**	**No decrease**		
1999-00:		No decrease		**Validation Procedure:** Data Collection before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.
2000-01:		No decrease		

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of parents having no high school diploma or Graduate Equivalency Diploma or a ninth-grade education or less at intake					**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Second national evaluation in 1996-97 had some accuracy problems with income survey questions. Third national evaluation currently under way benefits from improvements to the survey to increase the accuracy of income information.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	No Diploma or GED	Ninth Grade or Less			
1995-96:	87%	44%			
1996-97:	87%	45%			
1997-98:	85%	44%			
1998-99:	**84%**	**45%**	**No decrease**		
1999-00:			No decrease		
2000-01:			No decrease		

OBJECTIVE 3: LOCAL EVEN START PROJECTS WILL PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY, COMPREHENSIVE INSTRUCTIONAL AND SUPPORT SERVICES TO ALL FAMILIES IN A COST-EFFECTIVE MANNER.

Indicator 3.1 Service hours: Increasing percentages of projects will offer at least 60 hours of adult education (AE) per month, 20 hours of parenting education (PE) per month, and 65 hours of early childhood education (ECE) per month.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Half of projects offered at least the following numbers of hours per month of the three core components							**Status:** Positive movement toward target. **Explanation:** On average, projects have increased the number of service hours that they offer to participants. Although these data show positive movement toward the target, service intensity is not at the target level for the majority of projects.	**Source:** Second and Third National Even Start Evaluations: Universe Study. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Third National Evaluation: Universe Study 1999-2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data Collection before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data collections undertaken in 1995-98 required providers to report service hours in a way that was difficult for them to reliably calculate. The calculation method has been improved for the 1999-00 collection.
	AE		**PE**		**ECE**			
Year	**Actual**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**		
1995-96:	32		13		34			
1996-97:	36		14		36			
1997-98:	40		16		48			
1998-99:	**40**	**Continuing increase**	**16**	**Continuing increase**	**50**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		Continuing increase		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		60		20		65		

Indicator 3.2 Participation, retention, and continuity: Projects will increasingly improve retention and continuity of services.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of participating families who stayed in the program for more than 1 program year			**Status:** No significant progress toward target. **Explanation:** ED has observed a small but insignificant movement toward target. Projects are faced with new challenges related to the pressures associated with the competing demands of welfare reform.	**Source:** Third National Even Start Evaluation: Universe Study. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Third National Evaluation: Universe Study 1999-2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data Collection before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997-98:	38%			
1998-99:	**40%**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		60%		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		sources and experience corroborate these findings. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are grantee-collected and require accurate record-keeping. The calculation method has been improved for the 1999-00 collection.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Improve Even Start programs by identifying model projects and promising practices through the Staff Mentoring Sites project and high-quality evaluations; by disseminating these practices through an Internet listserv, newsletters, and regional meetings; and by conducting an analysis and evaluation of costs associated with Even Start.
- Work with states to encourage targeting and serving families most in need of services by
  - disseminating models and discussing targeting issues at state coordinators' meetings, with a particular focus on increasing the intensity and continuity of service for highly mobile families and families in rural areas, such as through distance learning, and
  - reviewing local applications during integrated reviews for statements on serving families most in need.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Work with HHS to coordinate performance indicators and measures by conducting an assessment of the scope, quality, and frequency of measurement of the current set of ED and HHS program performance indicators for its early childhood programs. Included in this analysis will be a comparison of both the GPRA indicators for the programs as well as the studies, reporting systems and evaluations, and measures used to report on the indicators and evaluate the programs. This analysis will help to inform a more coordinated effort and can guide ED in developing indicators and measures for Title I preschool and an ongoing future reporting system for Even Start outcomes (post Experimental Design Study).
- Work with HHS to better coordinate early childhood services in both agencies, through joint technical assistance and joint meetings of Head Start State Collaboration grantees and Even Start State Family Literacy Initiative grantees.
- Promote literacy in early childhood programs by producing a guide on best practices in early reading as well as assessing Even Start programs that provide high-quality, research-based early-literacy components using rigorous measures.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Work with Head Start program in the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education to compare and coordinate performance indicator and standards requirements at various levels for use in helping states develop their required indicators of quality for Even Start.
- Participate on the Education/Health and Human Services Coordinating Committee for early childhood and on the research/performance measures subgroup of that committee to plan coordination of measures.
- Work with Head Start and the Child Care Bureau to coordinate efforts of the Head Start State Collaboration grants and the Even Start Statewide Family Literacy Initiative grants. Meeting planned for summer 2000.
- Work with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education to develop distance learning materials to help improve service intensity.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Planning and Evaluation Service-sponsored national evaluations have shown that even though the number of service hours projects offer has increased on average, the service intensity of many projects could still be improved.
- Planning and Evaluation Service-sponsored national evaluations have shown that retaining program participants is a challenge, especially with welfare reform requirements.
- Evaluations continue to report that families served by Even Start have multiple high-need factors associated with low-income and under-education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 used the term "literacy measures;" the current Indicator 1.1 uses "measures of math and reading skills."
- Indicator 1.2 based percentage on all Even Start adults; the current Indicator 1.2 bases the percentage only on Even Start adults participating in ASE or Graduate Equivalency Diploma preparation.
- Indicator 1.3 used the term "school readiness and success;" the current Indicator 1.3 uses "language development and reading readiness."
- Indicator 3.1 is now Indicator 2.1.
- Indicator 4.1 is now Indicator 3.1, with some wording changes.
- Indicator 4.2 is now Indicator 3.2.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1 (adult employment) was dropped.
- Indicator 2.2 (continuing adult education) was dropped.
- Indicator 4.3 (local collaborations) was dropped.
- Indicator 5.1 (Federal technical assistance) was dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, and 3.2's specific 2001 targets were removed from the indicator wording.
- Indicators 1.1 and 1.3's 2001 targets were set for these indicators based on data from different assessments than will be used in the third national evaluation. Thus targets will need to be revisited when data on the new assessments become available.

Dropped

- FY 2000 Plan 4.1 (Federal technical assistance—an increasing percentage of local project directors will be satisfied with technical assistance and guidance) was dropped.

New--None.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MIGRANT EDUCATION

Goal: To assist migrant students reach challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Office of Migrant Education (OME) is designed to help migrant students reach high standards. It addresses the Department's Objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards), and Objective 1.5 (that families and communities be fully involved in meeting this goal).

FY 2000—$354,689,000

FY 2001—$380,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ALONG WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND STATE AND LOCAL REFORM EFFORTS, THE MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (MEP) WILL CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVED SCHOOL PERFORMANCE OF MIGRANT CHILDREN.

Indicator 1.1 State and local assessments: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels in state and local assessments (where in place).

Targets and Performance Data

Reading elementary

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Percent at or Above Proficient	Number of States	
1996-97:	50%	4 (of 10)	
1997-98:	50%	7 (of 15)	
1998-99:	**No data available**		**Continuing increase**
1999-00:			Continuing increase
2000-01:			Continuing increase

Reading middle

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Percent at or Above Proficient	Number of States	
1996-97:	50%	2 (of 10)	
1997-98:	50%	7 (of 15)	
1998-99:	**No data available**		**Continuing increase**
1999-00:			Continuing increase
2000-01:			Continuing increase

Math elementary

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Percent at or Above Proficient	Number of States	
1996-97:	50%	4	
1997-98:	50%	9	
1998-99:	**No data available**		**Continuing increase**
1999-00:			Continuing increase
2000-01:			Continuing increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: (a) In 1997-98, 7 of the 15 reporting states showed at least 50 percent of their migrant students scoring at or above the proficient level in reading, both in elementary and middle grade testing; (b) 9 of 15 states showed at least 50 percent of their migrant students scoring at or above the proficient level in math in elementary grade testing, while 7 of 15 reported the same in middle grade testing.

These scores show improvement since 1996-97, when (a) 4 of 10 states reported at least 50 percent of their migrant students scored at or above the proficient level in reading in elementary grade testing and 2 of 10 in middle grade testing; and (b) 4 of 10 states reported at least 50 percent of their migrant students scored at or above the proficient level in math in elementary grade testing and 3 of 10 reported the same in middle grade testing.

Explanation: It is likely that progress has been made because states are paying greater attention to migrant students' achievement. The requirement that all states disaggregate assessment results by migrant status has meant that states are now measuring migrant students' performance, and are therefore monitoring it, in many cases for the first time.

- Only 15 states reported assessment scores for migrant students by achievement levels.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Tabulations from the Council of Chief States School Officers State Education Indicators Report, 1999, and Council of Chief States School Officers State Education Indicators Report, 1998.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Update: 1998-99 data will be available February 2001.

Validation Procedure: Data is validated by internal review procedures of the Council of Chief State School Officers, an experienced data collection contractor.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: OME has described, through ED's data attestation process, the limitations of this indicator. The following are some of the limitations:

- While mean percentages can be calculated across the reporting states for broad categories of proficiency, they will be highly unreliable. This is because (a) reporting categories are not standardized, and (b) sample sizes are small and likely unrepresentative and thus imprecise.
- Until data precision is increased substantially, gains will be both difficult to detect and difficult to interpret.

Improvements will be addressed in OME's 2000 Data Improvement Plan.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Math middle				• States are not required to disaggregate statewide achievement data by migrant status until 2001. The year 1996-97 was the first year disaggregated data were available for at least two of the three states serving the greatest number of migrant students. • Future reports will be able to compare migrant students' performance to other students in their state.	
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Percent at or Above proficient	Number of States			
1996-97:	50%	3 (of 10)			
1997-98:	50%	7 (of 15)			
1998-99:	**No data available**		**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:			Continuing increase		
2000-01:			Continuing increase		

Indicator 1.2 Improved attention to assessment of migrant children: The number of states that include migrant students in state assessments linked to high standards will increase, reaching all states that receive Migrant Education Program (MEP) funds in 2001.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states and territories that included migrant students in their state assessment reports			**Status:** The number of states disaggregating the results of statewide assessment data is increasing. **Explanation:** • The number is required by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to reach 52 by 2001.	**Source:** Council of Chief States School Officers State Education Indicators Report, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* February 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data is validated by internal review procedures of Council of Chief State School Officers, an experienced data collection contractor. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** OME has described, through ED's data attestation process, the limitations inherent in this indicator. Primarily, the number of states will soon reach its maximum value of 52, and this is a limited measure of states' inclusion of migrant students in state assessments since we don't know what percentage of migrant students are included. Improvements will be addressed in OME's data improvement plan.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995-96:	11			
1996-97:	15			
1997-98:	19			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		52		

OBJECTIVE 2: STATES AND LOCAL DISTRICTS WILL PROVIDE EDUCATION SERVICES OUTSIDE THE REGULAR SCHOOL TERM TO HELP MIGRANT STUDENTS ACHIEVE TO HIGH STANDARDS.

Indicator 2.1 Summer education participation: Summer and intersession programs offer states and districts a way to help compensate for interruptions in learning caused by student mobility. States will demonstrate an increased emphasis on helping migrant students reach high standards by serving an increasing number in summer and intersession programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Numbers of summer and intersession participants			**Status:** The number of migrant students participating in summer sessions continues to increase.	**Source:** MEP State Performance Report, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001 (1998-99 Consolidated State Performance Report).
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995-96:	220,793			
1996-97:	283,026			
1997-98:	312,415			

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Research shows that extended time, including summer instruction, helps close the achievement gap between children from low-income families and others. With this indicator, OME knows that an increasing number of migrant students are receiving supplemental instruction, but we don't know definitively whether the instruction is helping to close the achievement gap for migrant students. We also do not know the extent to which summer and intersession programs meet migrant students' instructional needs.	**Validation Procedure:** Data is validated by internal review procedures of Westat, an experienced data collection contractor. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This is not an outcome measure; we don't know how summer programs are affecting migrant students. We also don't know whether summer programs are of high quality or if there is a difference in outcomes between high- and low-quality summer programs. OME will determine the feasibility of creating an indicator that can distinguish between (a) research-based, high-quality summer and intersession programs that respond proportionately to the problem of instructional continuity and (b) poor-quality programs. OME's goal will be to create better process measures to help us understand what promotes student achievement. This will be addressed in OME's data improvement plan.
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		

Indicator 2.2 Extended learning opportunities: The number of migrant out-of-school youth served during summer, intersession, and extended-time programs will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Out-of-school youth served in summer programs			**Status:** The number of out-of-school migrant youth participating in summer programs continues to increase. **Explanation:** Although more out-of-school youth are receiving supplemental instruction in summer programs, OME does not know the extent to which their participation promotes positive outcomes (e.g., increasing the likelihood that an out-of-school migrant youth reenters school).	**Source:** MEP State Performance Report, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data is validated by internal review procedures of Westat, an experienced data collection contractor. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as Indicator 2.1.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995-96:	7,593			
1996-97:	13,504			
1997-98:	14,297			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		

OBJECTIVE 3: THE MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (MEP) WILL INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICES TO MIGRANT CHILDREN THROUGH MORE EFFECTIVE COORDINATION AT THE STATE LEVEL.

Indicator 3.1 Family access to information: The number of migrant families using the toll-free number will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of toll-free calls			**Status:** Progress toward target. **Explanation:** The increase is a result of an intensified public awareness campaign and working more closely with growers.	**Source:** Usage reports from toll-free number coordination contract. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997-98:	10,717			
1998-99:	13,311			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by outside contractor; no formal verification procedure was applied.
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** These data measure access to information but not the quality of information received, nor the satisfaction of customers with that information. OME has asked the contractor to break phone calls out by category of information requested. It must be noted that the number of calls does not correspond with the number of families making calls.

Objective 4: ENCOURAGE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES.

Indicator 4.1 Schools serving migrant students will encourage and facilitate the participation of migrant parents in their children's education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of sampled principals reporting progress in school-parent compacts with migrant parents			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999. *Frequency:* Two school surveys. *Next Update:* 2001.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** According to the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 68.8 percent of a sample of principals of schools that enroll migrant students report that their school monitors the progress of the school-parent compact through records of involvement of parents of migrant students. This sample represents those NLSS principals who have migrants in their school, provide parent-school compacts to parents, and monitor whether parents have met their part of the compact. The second data point will not be available until 2001.	**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedure and NCES Statistical Standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** • Available data address schools, not states. • Addressing this objective on an ongoing basis will require special studies that sample migrant students and families. • This issue will be addressed in OME's 2000 Data Improvement Plan.
1998-99:	**68.8%**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Encourage states to coordinate their assessment procedures so migrant children are included in state assessments that are linked to high standards.
- Examine assessment data from states that can disaggregate data by migrant status.
- Encourage states and districts to establish summer programs, intersession programs, and extended day and school year programs for migrant children.
- Encourage states and districts to identify out-of-school migrant youth.
- Encourage states to form multistate consortia to develop materials and implement procedures for use across multiple states.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Support development and use of locator software to facilitate searches of state and regional databases to find and update records on migrant children.
- Establish and maintain substantive relationships with other Federal programs, including Migrant Health (HHS) and Migrant Labor (JTPA).
- Provide technical assistance, through site visits, policy letters, meeting presentations, and other methods of communication, to better coordinate services to migrant students across programs.
- Establish schoolwide programs at schools enrolling migrant children, and encourage the blending of Migrant Education Program (MEP) funds and services with other program funds so that migrant children can benefit more fully.
- Encourage states and schools to encourage full participation and inclusion of migrant parents in the education of their children.
- Encourage states and districts to work with agribusiness and other local organizations to support education services and the work of migrant families and workers.
- Encourage states and districts to work with Title I, Part A, staff to include migrant parents in the Title I, Part A, outreach activities authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
- Develop and implement a plan, called the Office of Migrant Education's 2000 Data Improvement Plan, to address data quality issues.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

N/A.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The most significant challenge is implementation of comprehensive, standards-based school reform that (a) can accommodate highly mobile students and (b) includes migrant and the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students within the State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) accountability systems.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicators 3.1, 3.3, 4.2, and 4.3 were dropped because they were not meaningful measures.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N OR D)

Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging state standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This program is designed to improve the education and employment opportunities of neglected and delinquent students. It addresses the Department's Objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards).

FY 2000—$42,000,000

FY 2001—$42,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N OR D) STUDENTS WILL IMPROVE ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL SKILLS NEEDED TO FURTHER THEIR EDUCATION OR OBTAIN EMPLOYMENT.

Indicator 1.1 Progress and achievement: An increasing number of states will show that Neglected or Delinquent students are obtaining General Equivalency Diplomas and are earning high school course credits.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.
1999:	**No data available**	**Unable to set**		*Frequency:* Uncertain.
2000:		Unable to set	**Explanation:** A synthesis of state agency evaluations was intended to inform this indicator; however, it was not possible to aggregate findings across states because states did not report consistent measures of academic performance. The Study of State Agency Activities will provide numbers of GEDs and course credits completed by students served by this program.	*Next Update:* 2000.
2001:		Unable to set		**Validation Procedure:** Data will be validated by contractor internal review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: ED plans to conduct annual short surveys of state agencies administered by a contractor, so that consistent measures are collected and can be aggregated.

OBJECTIVE 2: INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS WILL DEMONSTRATE OVERALL EDUCATIONAL REFORM THAT BETTER MEETS THE NEEDS OF NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, AND AT-RISK CHILDREN.

Indicator 2.1 Institution-wide programs: An increased percentage of institutions will operate institution-wide programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of N or D facilities that are institution-wide programs			**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Source:** Title I State Performance Report, 2000-01 (not yet published).
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Data from state performance reports indicate a 7 percent increase. These data do not include California.	*Frequency:* Annually.
1996:	9%			*Next Update:* 2001.
1997:	16%			
1999:	**No data available**	**Continued increase**		Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.
2000:		Continued increase		*Frequency:* Uncertain.
2001:		Continued increase		*Next Update:* 2000.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedure: Data will be validated by contractor internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This is a limited measure of educational reform in juvenile facilities. The Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I, should provide new data on education reform, enabling development of another, more descriptive indicator.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Develop and disseminate guidance on conducting evaluations of N or D programs to state agencies.
- Conduct workshops to discuss promising practices in correctional education at major conferences, including the IASA conferences, the Title I conference, and the Correctional Education Association Meeting.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Will add questions to data collections administered by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Will review OJJDP's data collection instruments that pertain to education.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- These students are both extremely disadvantaged and highly mobile. Education programs in juvenile facilities serve extremely needy children for short periods of time, and therefore it is very difficult to assess their academic progress. In addition, state capacity to track students systematically after they leave an institution is limited, further confounding our ability to assess the effects of the program on the population served. ED could not draw any systematic conclusions about program effectiveness from state evaluation reports.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was adjusted because we did not have data on high school diplomas or GEDs completed.
- Indicator 2.1 was adjusted to delete "integrating other Federal and state programs" because we were not collecting data on the quality of implementation and didn't know for sure that programs were being integrated.
- Indicator 2.2 was revised to focus on research-based programs rather than innovative practices, because innovation does not guarantee effectiveness. Research-based programs are likely to be effective.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was adjusted to report on more specific measures of academic progress, since we now have a vehicle for collecting this information.
- Indicator 2.1 was changed so that it no longer states "improve curriculum and instruction across the institution." We have changed this indicator because we are only collecting data on the number of institution-wide programs; we are not assessing the quality of the institution-wide programs or whether they improve curriculum and instruction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Dropped

- Objective 3 (transition to the community) and its three indicators were dropped. This objective is impossible to report on because states do not collect data on students once they leave institutions.
- Indicator 2.2 was dropped because it lacks specificity, and there is a scant research base on programs that are effective in serving this population of students, thus it would be difficult for agencies to adopt research-based programs.

New—None.

DEMONSTRATIONS OF COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM

Goal: Enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Program's activities support Objectives 1.1 (implement challenging standards); 2.2 (reading); 2.3 (math); 2.4 (special populations) by using CSRD models; and 3.1 (college preparation) by helping schools serving various grade levels implement effective, research-based, comprehensive reforms intended to raise student achievement. In addition to a focus on basic academics, the program supports Objectives 1.4 (professional development for teachers and staff), 1.5 (family involvement), and 1.3 (safe, strong, disciplined schools).
FY 2000—$220,000,000
FY 2001—$240,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN CORE SUBJECTS GENERALLY WILL SHOW MARKED IMPROVEMENT IN COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM DEMONSTRATION (CSRD) PROGRAM SCHOOLS.

Indicator 1.1 State and local assessments: Increasing percentages of students in CSRD program schools will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels of performance on state and local assessments in reading and math.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Data on changes in student performance not available until 2000. Progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 2000 (baseline). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		
2000:		Baseline to be established		Consolidated State Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 2000.
2001:		Continuing increase	**Explanation:** The CSRD program began in 1998. This indicator is a change measure. Therefore, this indicator will be based on measuring each school's progress against itself. As such, it is necessary to collect 2 years of data to establish a baseline student performance measure and evaluate changes in student achievement.	CSRD field-focused studies. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001.
			Progress toward the goal of continuing increase in student achievement is likely. Findings from the Department's study, Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children (1997), showed that students in schools using externally developed research-based school reform models tend to achieve greater academic gains than students in typical schoolwide programs. However, implementation research by RAND Corp. and others suggests that it takes 3 or more years for fully implemented models to yield achievement gains.	**Validation Procedure:** Data source verified by Department of Education attestation process and Department of Education Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The baseline has been changed for this performance indicator from 1999 to 2000. This reflects the nature of the indicator as a change measure that requires 2 years of student achievement data for reporting.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		The data for this indicator will be self-reported by State Education Agencies. A contractor is currently exploring electronic formats in which state assessment data are available by school and will assist in data collection for the state performance reports. One of the limitations of this data is that state assessments are in a transition period. States are not required to have their final assessment systems in place until the 2000-01 school year. It will be a challenge to report trends in the context of changing state assessments.

OBJECTIVE 2: THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PROVIDING HIGH-QUALITY CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION AND IMPROVING STUDENT OUTCOMES WILL INCREASE EACH YEAR.

Indicator 2.1 Implementation: The number of CSRD program schools meeting objectives for implementation will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting that they were involved in initial training and professional development around the model **Year / Actual Performance / Performance Targets** **1998-99: / 26% / N/A** 1999-00: / / Continuing increase 2000-01: / / Continuing increase 2001-02: / / Continuing increase *Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting that they had partially implemented their chosen model* **Year / Actual Performance / Performance Targets** **1998-99: / 25% / N/A** 1999-00: / / Continuing increase 2000-01: / / Continuing increase 2001-02: / / Continuing increase *Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting that their reform model is mostly implemented* **Year / Actual Performance / Performance Targets** **1998-99: / 36% / N/A** 1999-00: / / Continuing increase 2000-01: / / Continuing increase 2001-02: / / Continuing increase	**Status:** Baseline data reported. Data for 1999-00 available fall 2000. Progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The CSRD program began in 1998. The first year of data was 1998-99, which provided baseline data for this indicator. Progress on this indicator is likely as schools have time and external assistance to implement comprehensive school reform programs.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 (baseline). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected by Westat, Inc., and validated by internal procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** One of the limitations of these data is that the indicator depends on self-reports from CSRD program schools about the level of reform implementation. The CSRD field-focused studies, CSRD reports from the field, and other in-depth case studies under way will examine the implementation process in CSRD schools through observations.

Indicator 2.2 School improvement: Increasing numbers of CSRD program schools will no longer be designated as schools in need of improvement by their states.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I, upon receiving their awards between July 1998 and November 1999			**Status:** Baseline data reported. Data for 1999-2000 available fall 2000. No change data will be available until 2000. Progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** This indicator will track the status of the 726 schools identified for improvement under Title I when they received their CSRD program awards. The expectation is that increasing numbers of these schools will no longer be designated as in need of improvement. Data for 1999 and 2000 will be submitted in the state consolidated performance reports for the 1999-00 school year and the 2000-01 school year, due in December 2000 and December 2001, respectively. Progress toward target is likely because of implementation of a comprehensive school improvement effort in these schools, supported by expert external assistance.	**Source:** The Southwest Educational Laboratory Database of Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program schools, 1999(baseline)/ 2000. *Frequency:* N/A. *Next Update:* December 2000 (reported through Consolidated State Performance Reports). Consolidated State Performance Reports, 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by State Education Agencies. No formal verification process applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** There is a lack of consistent criteria across states for identifying Title I schools for improvement under ESEA Section 1116. In addition, states are not required to have their final assessment and accountability systems in place until the 2000-2001 school year. State processes for identifying schools in need of improvement are in a transition phase. In addition to these limitations, data are self-reported by State Education Agencies. A Department of Education contractor will assist State Education Agencies in submitting accurate and complete data and in analyzing the data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998-99:	**726 of 1,753 (41%)**	**N/A**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase in the number of originally identified schools that are no longer designated as in need of improvement		
2000-01:		Continuing increase in the number of originally identified schools that are no longer designated as in need of improvement		

Indicator 2.3 Impact on school improvement: The number of schools implementing comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of principals in Title I schools reporting that they are implementing a research-based school reform model			**Status:** Baseline data are reported. Data for 1999-2000 will be available fall 2000. Positive trend toward target is likely. **Explanation:** Data for the 1999-00 school year will be collected from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools as part of the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999(baseline)/2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected by Westat, Inc., and validated by internal procedures.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998-99:	**31%**	**N/A**		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01		Continuing increase		
2001-02		Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Progress on this indicator is expected because of increasing awareness of and support for comprehensive school reform among states, districts, and schools. One of the purposes of the program is to act as a catalyst for how Title I funds can be used in schoolwide programs to support the adoption of research-based comprehensive school reform programs.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are taken from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools; no data are available on all Title I schools. Because data are based on self-reports, it is difficult to judge the extent to which reform programs are comprehensive and research based. An examination of school documents on a subsample of Title I schools will allow some indication of the quality of comprehensive school reform efforts in Title I schools in general.

OBJECTIVE 3: FEDERAL LEADERSHIP, ASSISTANCE, AND GUIDANCE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH STATES AND LOCAL DISTRICTS WILL SUPPORT SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND IMPROVED SERVICES TO STUDENTS.

Indicator 3.1 Useful guidance: The percentage of state and local program coordinators who report that comprehensive reform implementation guidance and other assistance is helpful will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of state program coordinators who say that written information (e.g., guidance, mailings) was either "very helpful" or "helpful" in informing their understanding of the program

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	"Very Helpful"	"Helpful"	
1998:	60%	38%	
1999:	**No data available**		**100%**
2000:			100%
2001:			100%

Percentage of state program coordinators who said that other contacts, such as conferences, workshops, on-line services, and telephone contacts, were either "very helpful" or "helpful" in informing their understanding of the program

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	"Very Helpful"	"Helpful"	
1998:	49%	38%	Not applicable
1999:	**No data available**		**100%**
2000:			100%
2001:			100%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Baseline data are reported. Progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: Progress toward continuing high levels of satisfaction with Federal guidance on the CSRD program is expected. The program has established a listserv of state program coordinators and keeps in regular contact with states and districts on relevant news and activities.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Follow-Up Study of State Implementation, 1998 (baseline).
Frequency: N/A.
Next Update: N/A.

Validation Procedure: Data collected by Policy Studies Associates, Inc., and validated by internal procedures.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There is no regular vehicle to collect district-level information to inform this indicator. A survey of state program coordinators is planned for 2000-01.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To support adoption and implementation of effective comprehensive reform programs, the program will disseminate program guidance and information to assist states, districts, and schools.
- To design and carry out effective technical assistance strategies, the program will work with states, regional education laboratories, comprehensive centers, and other providers.
- To provide better information for program analysis and evaluation, the program will enhance the Southwest Educational Laboratory CSRD database.
- To gather and share lessons learned from states, districts, and schools, the program will continue the CSRD in the field initiative.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To disseminate information of interest to grantees and other interested organizations, the program will use its listservs and Web site.
- To improve the research base around comprehensive school reform, the Department will continue implementation of a high-quality national evaluation of CSRD and support additional research efforts on effectiveness of existing models.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To ensure wide availability of useful research and information, the program will work with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to support initial implementation of the new National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform.
- To allow CSRD schools to share information as they implement and evaluate comprehensive reforms, the Department will support the launch of a new lab-sponsored Web site.
- To support schools in adopting research-based strategies, the program will work with a regional lab to disseminate a new toolkit on comprehensive school reform and schoolwide programs.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program coordinates extensively with other programs and offices within the Department of Education, including other new initiative programs such as the Reading Excellence Act, Class-Size Reduction, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers.
- The program collaborates with Title I and Goals 2000 staff to strengthen schoolwide programs and district reforms via joint input on program guidance and strategy.
- The program works with Office of Educational Research and Improvement staff on coordination of technical assistance and on implementation and evaluation of new capacity-building and model design initiatives.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- States and districts have varying levels of experience in assisting schools with components of comprehensive reform.
- The initial capacity of schools to implement comprehensive reform varies.
- Many models have a limited research base and varying track records of effectiveness.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.3 (recognition for quality) was changed to last year's Indicator 2.3 (school improvement). The indicator now shows the number of schools no longer designated in need of improvement rather than schools designated as distinguished by their states. This change reflects the focus of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program on low-performing schools. In addition, data on school improvement are more consistently collected by states than data on distinguished schools. The Consolidated State Performance Report provides a mechanism for tracking all schools in the program. States will report if the status of any schools designated in need of improvement changes.
- Indicator 3.1 (useful guidance) was also adjusted. The wording of the indicator was changed from "the number of state and local program coordinators who report the comprehensive reform implementation guidance is timely, understandable, and informative" to "the number who report the guidance is helpful." The wording of the indicator was changed to more accurately reflect the survey question and ensure that data collected directly address the indicator.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 (state and local assessments) has been adjusted to specify a focus on reading and math achievement.
- Indicator 2.1 (implementation)—last year's Indicator 2.2—has been adjusted. The word "their" has been removed from this indicator to more accurately reflect the measure of implementation level that will be assessed in the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools. This analysis of data will use a uniform framework for assessing level of implementation rather than each school's own benchmarks. This standard framework will provide a generic benchmark that will ensure valid data that directly address this performance indicator.
- Indicator 2.1 (research based) and last year's Indicator 3.2 (impact on local understanding) have been combined into the new Indicator 2.3 (impact on school improvement). This new indicator is a clearer, more accurate measurement of how the program is leveraging comprehensive school reform, beyond grantee schools. The new indicator measures the number of Title I schools implementing comprehensive, research-based reforms, rather than attempting to measure what schools and districts know, which would be more difficult to capture.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2 (attendance) has been dropped. It is not expected to be a significant measure of program performance.

New—None.

HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM AND COLLEGE ASSISTANCE MIGRANT PROGRAM

Goal: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or get a job.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Office of Migrant Education's (OME) programs are designed to improve the achievement levels of older migrant students. They address Objectives 2.4 (special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards), 3.1 (that secondary school students get the support they need to prepare for postsecondary education), and 3.2 (that postsecondary students get the support they need to complete their educational program).

FY 2000—$22,000,000

FY 2001—$30,000,000 (Requested budget)

****HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM (HEP)****

OBJECTIVE 1: AN INCREASING PERCENTAGE OF HEP PARTICIPANTS WILL COMPLETE THE PROGRAM AND RECEIVE THEIR GED.

Indicator 1.1 GED completion: The percentage of HEP participants who complete the program and receive the GED will continue to remain high, if not increase.

Targets and Performance Data

HEP participants receiving a GED

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995-96:	70%	
1996-97:	66%	
1997-98:	72%	
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Same or increase**
1999-00:		Same or increase
2000-01:		Same or increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: The 1996-97 dip in the GED completion rate (from 70 percent down to 66 percent) has been reversed. The 1997-98 rate was 72 percent, an increase in 2 percentage points from the prior year.

Explanation: OME speculates that the 1996-97 dip in the GED completion rate was produced by problems experienced by several sites in adapting their programs to fit their students' needs. Participants in these programs appear to have completed their GEDs along with students enrolled in the 1997-98 cohort, boosting that year's GED rate to 72 percent.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data from three sites have been omitted because of apparent discrepancies; a review is under way.

OBJECTIVE 2: AN INCREASING PERCENTAGE OF HEP PARTICIPANTS WILL BEGIN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, ENTER MILITARY SERVICE, OR GET A JOB.

Indicator 2.1 Postsecondary entrance: The percentage of HEP participants with a GED who enroll in postsecondary programs will either equal or exceed the percentage achieved the previous year.

Targets and Performance Data

HEP participants with a GED who enroll in postsecondary programs

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**
1999-00		No target set
2000-01		Baseline

Assessment of Progress

Status: Cannot determine.

Explanation: These data have not been available in the past, as grantees have not kept track of former migrant students past completion of the GED. The Office of Migrant Education is working with grantees to start collecting these data. A baseline will be established in 2001.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data will be supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure will be applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Grantees will collect.

COLLEGE ASSISTANCE MIGRANT PROGRAM (CAMP)

OBJECTIVE 3: ALL CAMP STUDENTS WILL COMPLETE THEIR FIRST ACADEMIC YEAR AT A POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTION IN GOOD STANDING.

Indicator 3.1 Academic achievement: The percentage of CAMP participants who successfully complete the first year of an academic or postsecondary education program will either equal or exceed that achieved the previous year.

Targets and Performance Data

CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995-96:	84%	
1996-97:	85%	
1997-98:	88%	
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Same or increase**
1999-00		Same or increase
2000-01		Same or increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Positive upward trend toward target.

Explanation: The first year completion rate of CAMP participants has remained high over the past 3 years, increasing from 84 percent in 1995-96 to 85 percent in 1996-97, and then up again to 88 percent in 1997-98. OME speculates that CAMP is interacting more effectively with other components of the university environment to ensure that its students receive the support they need to complete the first year in good standing.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Improvements will be addressed in the Office of Migrant Education's (OME) 2000 Data Improvement Plan.

OBJECTIVE 4: CAMP STUDENTS WILL GRADUATE FROM 4-YEAR COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES AT HIGHER RATES.

Indicator 4.1 Student graduation: The percentage of former CAMP participants who complete a postsecondary degree program will be as high as that achieved by a comparable group of students.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of former CAMP participants who successfully complete a postsecondary degree

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**
1999-00		No target set
2000-01		Baseline

Assessment of Progress

Status: Cannot determine.

Explanation: These data have not been available in the past as CAMP grantees have not systematically tracked the progress made by former migrant students past completion of the 1-year CAMP effort. The Office of Migrant Education is working with grantees to start

Sources and Data Quality

Source: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data will be supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure will be applied.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	collecting these data. A baseline will be established in 2001.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** OME is working with grantees to provide detailed information within the annual performance reports.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- OESE will promote greater coordination of HEP with the MEP and with other adult education, high school completion, and dropout prevention programs administered by OVAE and OPE.
- OESE will work with HEP projects to collect standardized information on participant outcomes and activities.
- Statutory changes will be proposed to strengthen preparation for postsecondary education and to better target program services on those persons engaged in seasonal farmwork or currently eligible for services as migrant or seasonal farmworkers under the MEP or JTPA Section 402 program.
- OESE will promote coordination of CAMP with the MEP and other relevant OPE programs (e.g., TRIO).
- OESE will work with CAMP projects to collect standardized information on participant outcomes and activities.
- Statutory changes will be proposed to improve targeting of CAMP services on those persons currently eligible for services as migrant or seasonal farmworkers under the MEP or JTPA Section 402 program.
- OESE will work with HEP and CAMP grantees to collect outcome data describing where students go once they have finished HEP and CAMP.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

None.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

IMPACT AID

IMPACT AID

Goal: To provide appropriate financial assistance for Federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Impact Aid program supports Objective 1.3 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides support to school districts that are affected by Federal activities.
FY 2000—$906,452,000
FY 2001—$770,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: MAKE PAYMENTS IN A TIMELY MANNER.

Indicator 1.1 Timeliness of payments: At least 90 percent of eligible applicants will receive initial Basic Support and Children With Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Source:** Impact Aid System, 2000.
1997:	75%			*Frequency:* Annually.
1998:	87%		**Explanation:** 1999 payments were delayed by implementation of a new Y2K-compliant system. Performance for FY 2000 resumed expected trend to surpass target.	*Next Update:* FY 2001.
1999:	**13%**	**90%**		
2000:	*96%	90%		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
2001:		90%		
*As of December 27, 1999, 38 days after the appropriation				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No significant limitations.

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE CONSULTATION BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND THE INDIAN COMMUNITY TO SUPPORT THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN.

Indicator 2.1 Indian community consultation: At least 75 percent of Title IX (Indian Education) coordinators in school districts that receive Impact Aid will report that the district solicits input from the Indian community on strategies for increasing the achievement of Indian children.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Title IX performance reports.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		75%	**Explanation:** Baseline data will be collected beginning in FY 2000 through a question included in the Title IX performance report.	*Next Update:* FY 2000.
2001:		75%		
				Validation Procedure: Data will be verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Title IX coordinators' survey responses may not accurately reflect the quality of LEAs' parental and tribal consultation.

OBJECTIVE 3: MAKE ACCURATE PAYMENTS.

Indicator 3.1 Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support payments, Children With Disabilities payments, and Heavily Impacted Districts payments will not exceed 10 in a given fiscal year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target met.	**Source:** Program office files, 2000.
1998:	4 requests			*Frequency:* Annually.
1999:	**5 requests**	**No more than 10 requests**	**Explanation:** The performance information shows no significant change in the number of payment errors that result in overpayment forgiveness requests.	*Next Update:* FY 2000.
2000:		No more than 10 requests		
2001:		No more than 10 requests		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No significant limitations.

OBJECTIVE 4: CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN, REPAIR, RENOVATE, AND TRANSFER SCHOOL FACILITIES.

Indicator 4.1 Facility transfers: At least 2 school facilities a year will be removed from the inventory of 50 school facilities owned by the Department.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target met.	**Source:** Program files.
1996:	4 removals			*Frequency:* Annually.
1997:	2 removals		**Explanation:** The performance information shows that ED continues to make progress in transferring school facilities to local educational agencies.	*Next Update:* FY 2001.
1998:	3 removals			
1999:	**2 removals**	**At least 2 removals**		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
2000:		At least 2 removals		
2001:		At least 2 removals		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No significant limitations.

OBJECTIVE 5: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES USED TO EDUCATE INDIAN CHILDREN.

Indicator 5.1 Construction: By 2004, at least 70 percent of the schools in LEAs that receive these payments will report that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Impact Aid applications, beginning with FY 2001 application.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** Baseline data will be collected from FY 2001 Impact Aid applications, available summer 2000.	*Next Update:* FY 2000.
2001:		No target set		
				Validation Procedure: Data will be verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Propose formula changes through legislation and appropriations language to ensure that funds are directed to districts serving Federally connected children for whom the Federal Government has a primary obligation.
- Improve review procedures.
- Implement new payment system on Windows 95 platform with more sophisticated capabilities.
- Minimize payment errors by continuing quality control procedures.
- Help school districts support Indian community consultation by providing increased technical assistance.
- Continue to request funding to maintain in a safe condition school buildings owned by the Department and to fund renovation and transfer projects.
- Continue negotiations with school districts to ensure timely transfer of facilities.
- Seek increased funding for the improvement of school facilities in Indian country by requesting increased funding under Section 8007 targeted to Impact Aid districts in which at least 50 percent of the children live on Indian lands.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Proposed reauthorization of Section 8007 to target construction funds on Impact Aid school districts with at least 50 percent Indian lands children, requiring matching funds from state or local sources to increase efforts to improve school facilities serving Indian children.
- Proposed language for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization to strengthen the Indian community consultation requirements and increase accountability for the use of Impact Aid funds for Indian children.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Support increased consultation with the Indian community by working with the Office of Indian Education to implement the Executive Order on American Indian and Alaskan Native Education.
- Encourage the transfer of ED-owned school facilities to local school districts by cooperating with the Department of Defense to develop creative funding arrangements to address facilities improvement projects.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Gaining acceptance of proposed legislative changes by the Impact Aid community and Congress will be challenging.
- Program performance indicators do not measure the extent to which the program goal is achieved. Achievement of the program goal depends on appropriations level and statutory formula provisions.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1 was modified slightly in wording to this year's Indicator 1.1.
- Indicator 5.1 was modified to this year's Indicator 4.1. The target was changed from six schools annually to at least two schools annually because recent appropriations for this activity have not been sufficient to support six school transfers annually.

Dropped

- Objective 1 (provide payments on behalf of Federally connected children...) and Objective 4 (provide payments that support adequate current expenditures) were dropped because these objectives were tied to the level of appropriations.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New

- Objective 5 and Indicator 5.1 were added.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

INNOVATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM STRATEGIES

Goal: To support state and local efforts to accomplish promising education reform programs.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Innovative Education Program Strategies (Title VI) enables local educational agencies to deploy resources in eight categories designed to improve educational opportunities in areas such as help for at-risk children (Objective 2.4), programs to increase parental involvement (Objective 1.5), enhanced library services, and professional development for teachers (Objective 1.4). Because Title VI can be broadly applied by superintendents and principals, it addresses most of the objectives.

FY 2000—$365,750,000

FY 2001—$0 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: TITLE VI-FUNDED ACTIVITIES WILL SUPPORT LOCAL EDUCATION REFORM EFFORTS.

Indicator 1.1 Reform efforts: Increasing percentage of funds allocated to LEAs will be used for local reform efforts other than the purchase of instructional and educational materials.

Targets and Performance Data

Percent of Title VI funds allocated to support reform efforts other than the purchase of instructional and educational materials

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995-96:	59%	
1996-97:	59%	
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**
1999-00:		Continuing increase
2000-01:		Continuing increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data at this time. However, progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: Data for the 1998-99 school year are not yet available.

(Performance Indicator)
The Department believes that Title IV funds are better used for local reform efforts other than the purchase of instructional and educational materials. The Department encourages local school districts to use funds for other allowable reform efforts.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.
Frequency: Biennially.
Next Update: Consolidated State Performance Report, 2001.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by states. No formal verification procedures applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Self-reported.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Make presentations at regional and national meetings to assist Title VI coordinators in ensuring program funds are used in a manner consistent with state and local reform plans.
- Provide coordinators with information on activities, aligned with the purposes of the program, which have been proven effective.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Joint activities occur at the state and local levels.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Difficult to determine effectiveness of the program because it is unfocused and lacks comparability and accountability measures.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years ago)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was adjusted.

Dropped

- Objective 2 and Indicators 2.1 and 2.2 were dropped.

New—None.

CLASS-SIZE REDUCTION PROGRAM

Goal: Reduce average class size nationally, particularly in the early grades, to improve student achievement.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Class-Size Reduction Program directly supports Objective 1.4 (a talented teacher in every classroom) by providing high-quality teacher training. The program also supports Objective 2.1 (children start school ready to learn) and directly supports Objective 2.2 (every child reading by the third grade) by enabling more individual attention in the early grades. The program supports Objective 3.1 (safe, disciplined schools) by providing a conducive learning environment.

FY 2000—$1,300,000,000

FY 2001—$1,750,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

Indicator 1.1 State/local assessments: Increasing percentages of fourth graders at schools receiving program funds will score at basic, proficient, or advanced levels in reading on state or local assessments.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available because this is a new program. **Explanation:** First data reporting will be due in late 2000.	**Source:** LEA report cards. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by states and districts. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** States do not routinely assess children in the grades affected by this program. It would be difficult to attribute achievement data collected to the program. Since this program targets children in the early grades, not grade 4, there will be a significant lag in time between receipt of funds and improvements in student achievement at grade 4.
1999:	**New program**	**No target set**		
2000:		Target to be set		
2001:		Increasing		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 2: TO REDUCE AVERAGE CLASS SIZE NATIONALLY IN GRADES 1-3.

Indicator 2.1 Additional teachers hired: By 2005, school districts will hire 100,000 additional teachers above those expected to be hired without the program.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Movement toward target is likely. **Explanation:** National estimates of Early Implementation Reports (EIRs) data show significant progress toward target. About 29,000 teachers were hired with CSR funds.	**Source:** Early Implementation Reports, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 **Source:** Consolidated State Reports. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* Dec. 2000 **Source:** National Evaluation. *Frequency:* One time *Next Update:* 2001 **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by states and districts. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The 29,000 teacher figure is a national estimate based on only 37 percent of districts who reported data as of November 1999 (46 percent of districts are reflected in the data base if the state-level data received from four states for some districts are included). A comparison of responding versus nonresponding districts showed that districts who responded to the data collection were more likely to fall into the highest poverty quartile (over 24.7 percent) and less likely to be small in terms of enrollment. Since the amount of funding given to districts depends solely on poverty (80 percent) and enrollment (20 percent), it is likely that attempts to make national estimates based on this 37 percent of districts are biased.
1999:	**< 29,000**	**30,000**		
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		
2002:		Continuing increase		
2003:		Continuing increase		
2004:		Continuing increase		
2005:		100,000		

Indicator 2.2 Number of students per class: Local school districts will reduce the maximum or average number of students per class in grades 1-3 so that the national average class size will be 18 by 2005.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** LEAs are reporting that class size is being reduced. Moving toward target is likely.	**Source:** Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94. *Frequency:* 5 years. *Next Update:* Early Implementation Reports, 2000; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1998-99; State Consolidated Reports, 2000; National Evaluation, 2001.
1993-94:	21.9			
1999-98:	**No data available**	**Decreasing**		
2000-01:		Decreasing	**Explanation:** New program; baseline from Schools and Staffing Survey is a placeholder for information from the national evaluation, which will be available in next year's plan.	**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.
2001-02:		Decreasing		
2002-03		Decreasing		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** There are several ways to measure class size and there is no consensus about the most appropriate way to define class size for the purpose of evaluating class-size initiatives. It will be challenging to accurately portray the effect this program has on class size. The planned national evaluation of the program will attempt to combat this problem by collecting raw information of several key factors in order to calculate class size in an accurate way that also reflects the flexibility of this program.
2003-04:		Decreasing		
2004-05:		18		

OBJECTIVE 3: TO ENSURE THAT NEWLY HIRED AND EXISTING TEACHERS ARE HIGHLY QUALIFIED AND PREPARED TO TEACH IN THEIR ASSIGNED GRADES OR SUBJECT AREAS.

Indicator 3.1 Increased professional development: Increasing percentages of teachers in grades 1-3 will participate in high-quality professional development in content areas and effective teaching methods.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available because this is a new program.	**Source:** New program. *Frequency:* One –time. *Next Update:* National evaluation, 2001.
1999:	**No data available**	**Increasing**		
2000:		Increasing	**Explanation:** First data report will be in 2001.	
2001		Increasing		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: It would be difficult to accurately measure the concept of high-quality professional development. In addition, the planned national evaluation will only measure professional development participation for teachers affected by this program, not all teachers in the United States, as implied by the indicator wording.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Work with states to distribute grant money on July 1, 2000, and October 1, 2000.
- Collaborate with the Department's existing programs (such as the Eisenhower Professional Development Program) to improve preservice and in-service professional development for teachers through regular meetings with program staff to share existing and acquire new information.
- Encourage state and local education agencies to share effective and creative approaches to teacher availability, limited classroom/building space, certification requirements, collective bargaining agreements, and other issues through facilitated workshops and through development by the Class-Size Reduction Team of a publication that contains information on such approaches.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Beginning of national evaluation.
- Invitational conference, December 1999, on "How Small Classes Help Teachers and Students Do Their Best."
- Establishment and use of listserv for state CSR coordinators and other interested parties.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Grant to Bureau of Indian Affairs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Uncertainty of funding from year to year, lack of qualified teachers in some locations, space limitations in some facilities.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years ago)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1 was dropped because it overlapped with Indicator 2.2.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 3.2 was folded into Indicator 3.1 because they overlapped.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS PROGRAM—STATE GRANTS PROGRAM AND NATIONAL PROGRAMS

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants Program and National Programs support Objective 1.3 (schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free) by providing funds through formula and discretionary grants to states, governors' offices, and other grantees in support of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and services to create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environments.

FY 2000—$600,000,000

FY 2001—$650,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: REDUCE THE USE AND AVAILABILITY OF ALCOHOL AND DRUGS IN SCHOOLS.

Indicator 1.1 Drug use in schools by 2001: Rates of annual alcohol use in schools will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, and rates of annual marijuana use in school for the same time period will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders.

Targets and Performance Data

Rate of annual use of alcohol in school

Year	8th Graders		12th Graders	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	5%		8%	
1995:	5%		7%	
1996:	6%		8%	
1997:	5%		8%	
1998:	5%		8%	
1999:	**4%**	**5%**	**7%**	**8%**
2000:		5%		8%
2001:		4%		7%

Rate of annual use of marijuana and other drugs in school

Year	8th Graders*		12th Graders**	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	4%		8%	
1995:	5%		9%	
1996:	6%		10%	
1997:	5%		10%	
1998:	5%		8%	
1999:	**4%**	**5%**	**8%**	**10%**
2000:		4%		8%
2001:		3%		7%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Alcohol (8th grade)—target exceeded. Alcohol (12th grade)—target exceeded.

*Marijuana and other drugs (8th grade)—target exceeded. **Marijuana only (12th grade)—target exceeded.

Explanation: Rates of substance use in school generally parallel but are much lower than overall rates of substance use by youth. Rates of alcohol use for all grade levels have remained relatively steady for many years and are therefore unlikely to decline in the near future. Marijuana use rates increased in the midnineties but recently have been relatively steady and may have leveled off.

(Data for 10th graders are available but are not included because of space limitations. In general, 8th and 10th grade trends have been similar in recent years.)

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Monitoring the Future (MTF), 1999 (special analysis, 2000).
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000 (special analysis, 2001).

Validation Procedures: Data validated by University of Michigan Institute for Social Research and National Institute on Drug Abuse procedures.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: According to NCES calculations, the total response rate for this survey has varied between 46 percent and 67 percent since 1976. MTF does not release its data on in-school use; special runs for these data are generally not available until the spring of the year following the December release of other MTF data. MTF does not collect data for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders on drug use in school in a way that allows data to be compared across the three grades.

OBJECTIVE 2: REDUCE ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE AMONG SCHOOL-AGED YOUTH.

Indicator 2.1 Drug use by school-aged children by 2000: Rates of 30-day prevalence of alcohol use will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, and rates of 30-day prevalence of illicit drug use will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders.

Targets and Performance Data

Rate of 30-day alcohol use

Year	8th Graders		12th Graders	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	26%		50%	
1995:	25%		51%	
1996:	26%		51%	
1997:	25%		53%	
1998:	23%		52%	
1999:	**24%**	**23%**	**51%**	**45%**
2000:		21%		41%
2001:		No increase		No increase

Rate of 30-day illicit drug use

Year	8th Graders		12th Graders	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	11%		22%	
1995:	12%		24%	
1996:	15%		25%	
1997:	13%		26%	
1998:	12%		26%	
1999:	**12%**	**13%**	**26%**	**23%**
2000:		12%		20%
2001:		No increase		No increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Alcohol—no change. Illicit drugs—no change.

Explanation: Rates of alcohol use for all grade levels have remained relatively steady for many years. Drug use rates, which increased in the mid1990's, have recently been relatively steady and may have leveled off. Targets for 1999 and 2000 were established by ONDCP to reflect a desired 20 percent decline from 1996 rates; however, it is unlikely that the ambitious targets for 10th and 12th graders will be achieved. Youth rates of alcohol and drug use are affected by factors SDFS programs cannot always overcome, including social and cultural mores, parental attitudes, and advertising and other media images.

(Data for 10th graders are available but are not included because of space limitations. In general, 8th and 10th grade trends have been similar in recent years.)

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Monitoring the Future (MTF), 1999.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedures: Data validated by University of Michigan Institute for Social Research and National Institute on Drug Abuse procedures.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: According to NECS calculations, the total response rate for this survey has varied between 46 percent and 67 percent since 1976.

OBJECTIVE 3: REDUCE NUMBER OF CRIMINAL AND VIOLENT INCIDENTS IN SCHOOLS.

Indicator 3.1 Violent incidents in schools by 2001: The proportion of high school students in a physical fight on school property will decrease, and the annual rate of students ages 12 to 18 who report experiencing serious violent crime, in school or going to and from school, will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of high school students who reported being involved in a physical fight on school property in the past year

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995:	16%	
1997:	15%	
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**14%**
2000:		No data collection
2001:		12%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Physical fights—no 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely.

Serious violent crime—no 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: The percentage of students reporting being in a fight at school has declined since 1995, and overall juvenile crime and violence rates are down; it therefore appears likely that the percentage of students in a fight at school will continue to decline. For students reporting victimization by serious

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 1997.
Frequency: Biennially.
Next Update: 1999 data to be reported in 2000.

National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), 1997 (special analysis, 1999).
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 1998 data to be reported in 2000.

Validation Procedures: YRBS data validated by Westat and CDC procedures. NCVS data

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Rate of students ages 12 to 18 who reported experiencing serious violent crime in schools or going to and from school			violent crime, according to 1997 survey data released in 1999, the 1999 target has been met. Rates of violent crime victimization at school, like other measures of juvenile crime and violence, have been dropping in recent years and are likely to continue to decline.	validated by Census Bureau and Bureau of Justice Statistics procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** YRBS data are collected biennially and reported the year after collection; 1999 data will be reported in 2000. Most NCVS data are reported the year after collection, but in-school victimization data is a special analysis with a delayed release, so the 1998 data will be available in 2000 and the 1999 data will be available in 2001.
1994:	13 per 1,000			
1995:	9 per 1,000			
1996:	9 per 1,000			
1997:	8 per 1,000			
1998:	Data not available			
1999:	**Data not available**	**8 per 1,000**		
2000:		8 per 1,000		
2001:		7 per 1000		

Indicator 3.2 Weapons in schools: By 2001, the proportion of high school students carrying weapons (including firearms) to school will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of high school students who reported carrying a weapon on school property in the previous 30 days			**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The percentage of students reporting carrying a weapon at school has declined since 1995, and overall juvenile crime and violence rates are down; it therefore appears likely that the percentage of students carrying a weapon at school will continue to decline.	**Source:** Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 1997. *Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* 1999 data to be reported in 2000. **Validation Procedures:** YRBS data validated by Westat and CDC procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** YRBS data are collected biennially and reported the year after collection; 1999 data will be reported in 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995:	10%			
1997:	9%			
1999:	**Data not available**	**7%**		
2000:		No data collection		
2001:		6%		

Indicator 3.3 School-related homicides: For school year 2000-01, the number of school-associated homicides will decline.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
School-associated homicides			**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The number of school-associated homicides has declined in recent years, even though several events involving multiple victims have occurred. Overall juvenile crime and violence rates are also down. It is likely that the number of school-associated homicides will continue to decrease.	**Source:** Study by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and ED, 1999. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data validated by CDC procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This is a special study using retrospective data collection. ED's reauthorization proposal would require states to report school-associated homicides to ED within 30 days of an incident.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1992-93:	55			
1997-98:	46			
1998-99:	Data not available	**Continuing decrease**		
1999-00:		Continuing decrease		
2000-01:		41		

OBJECTIVE 4: HELP SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES GRANTEES SELECT AND IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS THAT HAVE BEEN EVALUATED AND FOUND TO BE EFFECTIVE.

Indicator 4.1 Increase pool of promising and exemplary programs: By 2002, identify additional drug and violence prevention programs that have been rigorously evaluated and found to be either promising or exemplary, as defined by an expert panel.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The SDFS Expert Panel has not yet announced its initial findings, so baseline has not been established.			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The SDFS Expert Panel has not yet announced its initial findings.	**Source:** Results of review process by SDFS Expert Panel, 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data verified by ED attestation process. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**Data not available**	**Continuing increase**		
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		

Indicator 4.2 Coordinators: By 2001, all drug prevention and school safety coordinators funded by the middle-school coordinator initiative will have received training to implement effective, research-based programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Training has not yet begun. The first training session is scheduled for February 2000.			**Status:** Positive movement toward target. **Explanation:** Grants have been awarded under this initiative and coordinators are being hired. A training and technical assistance contract has been awarded and training sessions for all coordinators have been scheduled to begin in February 2000.	**Source:** Review of program files. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data verified by ED attestation process **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The current wording of this indicator focuses on implementation of the initiative. ED has recently awarded a contract for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the initiative. Once the study is under way, the indicator will be revised to incorporate data from the study. Examples of measures that may be selected include professional development of teachers and other staff by coordinators in grantee sites, and use of research-based approaches implemented with fidelity.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**Data not available**	**Continuing increase**		
2000:		65% of coordinators trained		
2001:		100% of coordinators trained		

Indicator 4.3 Grantee progress: By 2001, National Programs grantees will demonstrate substantial progress toward achieving their results-based goals and objectives established in their applications.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives will be incorporated into all FY 2000 grant applications			**Status:** New indicator for FY 2001 budget cycle. **Explanation:** All applicants for National Programs direct grants from FY 2000 funds will be required to provide results-based goals and objectives for their projects.	**Source:** Review of program files. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next update:* Spring 2001. **Validation Procedures:** Data verified by ED attestation process. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**Data not available**	**New indicator in 2000**		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		By the end of year one, all grantees will meet 75% of established measurable goals and objectives.		

OBJECTIVE 5: ENCOURAGE COMMUNITY-WIDE COLLABORATION IN THE CREATION OF SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS.

Indicator 5.1 Community-wide collaboration: By 2004, grantees receiving funds through the Safe Schools/Healthy Students interagency initiative will show progress in maintaining safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environments.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New indicator for FY 2001 budget cycle. **Explanation:** Grants have been awarded under this initiative, and a cooperative agreement has been awarded for the national evaluation.	**Source:** Review of program files. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next Update:* 2000. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This is an interagency initiative jointly supported by ED; DOJ; HHS; and, beginning in 2001, the Department of Labor. The agencies will collaborate to select specific measures and overall performance targets for the initiative. These measures and targets will be drawn from the national evaluation of the initiative, which is in its beginning stages. Once the study is fully underway, the indicator will be revised to incorporate baseline data and performance targets for specific measures. Examples of measures that may be selected include rates of student alcohol and drug use in grantee sites, rates of suspensions and expulsions in grantee sites, and rates of weapon carrying in schools in grantee sites.
1999:	**Data not available**	**New indicator in 2000**		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		Grantees overall will demonstrate progress on selected performance measures, common to all grantees, from the national evaluation of the initiative.		

OBJECTIVE 6: PROVIDE CRISIS INTERVENTION ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Indicator 6.1 Crisis intervention: By 2001, the Department will implement policies and procedures necessary to ensure rapid response to school districts seriously affected by crises that interfere with learning.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No change.	**Source:** Review of program files and organizational plans.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Ongoing.
2000:		Policies and procedures developed	**Explanation:** No funding has been approved by Congress for this initiative. ED will continue to seek express statutory authority for this initiative in future years.	*Next Update:* 2000.
2001:		ED will initiate response to all eligible requests for assistance within 48 hours.		**Validation Procedures:** Data verified by ED attestation process.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Encourage implementation of research-based programs through implementation of Principles of Effectiveness; the Expert Panel project, in coordination with the Department of Health and Human Services, to identify exemplary and promising prevention programs; the redesigned Recognition Program to identify schools implementing exemplary and promising strategies; middle school coordinators grants that will support the hiring of staff to select and implement research-based programs; and demonstration grants to test and identify programs suitable for replication in other school sites.
- Target resources by providing direct grants to local school districts with significant drug and violence problems that are being addressed in partnership with law enforcement and community mental health services providers (see discussion of Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative under "Coordination" section).
- Develop and disseminate information, including the Annual Report Card, in coordination with the U.S. Department of Justice, to enhance public awareness about the nature and character of school violence and to identify effective practices; Early Warning, Timely Response and its companion publication, Safeguarding Youth: A Guide to Implementing Early Warning, Timely Response; and Growing Up Drug-Free: A Parent's Guide to Prevention.
- Train middle school coordinators, hired with grant funds, to select and implement research-based drug and violence prevention programs.
- Continue to seek express statutory authority for the School Emergency Response to Violence (SERV) initiative to provide crisis intervention services to districts seriously affected by traumatic events that disrupt learning.
- Support the Higher Education Center for Campus-Based Drug and Violence Prevention Programs.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Reauthorization proposal is designed to improve accountability for program funds and encourage adoption of comprehensive, research-based programs by (a) establishing core performance indicators; (b) targeting funds to LEAs with significant need and high-quality programs; (c) focusing Governor's Program on creation of safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments; (d) developing school safety plans; and (e) implementing SEA, LEA, and school report cards that include school safety items. The establishment of core program indicators is intended to result in more uniform information on program implementation and effectiveness; the proposal also requires annual submission of program performance reports. The proposal also requires that LEAs support comprehensive plans and report on their performance against established objectives; states would be required to consider the quality of LEA plans in awarding funds, and to consider performance as a criterion for continuation funding.
- Discretionary grantees will be required to measure and report their progress in reaching their measurable goals and objectives.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Supports data collection activities carried out by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Justice, e.g., Monitoring the Future, Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance, Health Behaviors of School Children Study, School-Associated Violence Death Study, and National Crime Victimization Survey.
- Collaborates with other agencies to evaluate joint initiatives, e.g., National Study on School Violence (Department of Justice), National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools (Department of Justice); a national evaluation of the impact of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative (Departments of Justice, Health and Human Services, and—in 2001—the Department of Labor); and School Health Policies and Program's Study (Department of Health and Human Services).

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES (CONTINUED)

- Information dissemination and technical assistance: With Health and Human Services and Department of Justice engages in a variety of activities to provide information and training and technical assistance to the field, e.g., the Annual Report on School Safety, an implementation guide to Early Warning, Timely Response; National Center for Conflict Resolution, the National Resource Center for Safe Schools, and the Youth Court Training and Technical Assistance Program; technical assistance to Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees, satellite training sessions on violence prevention strategies.
- Program improvement activities: Enhances the quality and rigor of prevention programs in schools and communities, through initiatives such as Safe Schools/Healthy Students; Fast Track (with the Department of Health and Human Services), an intervention for high-risk youth in grades 6 to 10 and their families; diffusion of risk/protective-factor-focused drug prevention for adolescents at the state and community level; one-to-one mentoring programs for youth at risk of education failure or involvement in delinquent activities (with the Department of Justice); and Project SHOUT (with the Office of National Drug Control Policy), which supports effective approaches to the prevention of youth substance abuse through public education.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Lack of uniform information on program activities and effectiveness make Federal oversight difficult. (Reauthorization proposal includes development of common core of indicators and information requirements). [GAO Study, October 1997]
- Reporting required from states every 3 years may be insufficient for congressional oversight. (Reauthorization proposal requires annual reporting.) [GAO Study, October 1997]
- LEAs should report on actual performance against performance indicators and should submit comprehensive plans with detailed descriptions of programs and services that align with measurable goals. (Reauthorization proposal requires these elements.) [OIG Report, December 1998]
- States should consider effectiveness of LEA-completed activities as a criterion for awarding greatest need funds. (Reauthorization proposal requires states to award all funds based on combination of need and quality of plan.) [OIG Study, December 1998]
- States should consider LEA performance as a criterion for continuation funding. (Reauthorization proposal requires states to determine if LEAs have made "substantial progress" in order to receive continuation funding.) [OIG Study, December, 1998]

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was modified so that a specific target was set for reduced drug and alcohol use in schools.
- Indicators 2.1 and 2.2 were modified from "number of" to "proportion of."
- Indicator 2.5 (this year's Indicator 2.3) was changed from an indicator to targets.
- Indicator 3.1 (this year's Indicator 3.1) was changed from an indicator to targets.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.2, 2.4, and 2.6 were dropped.
- Objectives 4 through 8 and their indicators were dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1: The wording has been revised from "serious violent incidents in schools" to "violent incidents in schools" to more accurately describe the data the indicator is tracking.
- Indicator 2.1: In 1999, the Bureau of Justice Statistics revised its data on rates of serious violent crime victimization in schools, to correct a calculation error in previous reports. Indicator wording, performance data, and targets have been revised to reflect the corrected data.
- Indicator 2.3: New data provide information on school-associated homicides for individual school years rather than data for 2 combined years, so indicator wording, performance data, and target have been revised to reflect the updated data.
- Indicator 5.1: The wording has been revised to provide more information about activities planned.
- Objective 7 and Indicator 7.1 have been renumbered; they are now this year's Objective 5 and Indicator 5.1 (no change in wording).

Dropped

- Indicator 5.1 has been retained for internal management purposes and is no longer part of this report.
- Indicator 5.2 has been renumbered; it is now Indicator 4.2 (no change in wording).
- Indicator 6.1 has been retained for internal management purposes and is no longer part of this report.
- Indicator 6.2 has been retained for internal management purposes and is no longer part of this report.
- Indicator 6.3 has been retained for internal management purposes and is no longer part of this report.

New

- New indicator 4.3 has been added to strengthen indicators provided for national programs.

INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION

Goal: To provide programs that promote literacy skills and motivate children to read, including distributing inexpensive books to children.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Inexpensive Book Distribution program supports Objective 2.2 (every child reads by and of the third grade) by distributing books and other activities to motivate and help children read well.

FY 2000—$20,000,000

FY 2001—$20,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: SUPPORT THE GOALS OF THE AMERICA READS CHALLENGE AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S PRIORITY OF HAVING CHILDREN READ INDEPENDENTLY AND WELL BY THE END OF GRADE 3, AND SUPPORT AND PROMOTE LITERACY DEVELOPMENT THROUGH GRADE 12 THROUGH READING IS FUNDAMENTAL (RIF) PROJECTS.

Indicator 1.1 The percentage and number of children served and books distributed in partnerships with school reading programs will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Performance reports.
1999:	**First data 2000**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:	Report Jan 2001	Baseline data	**Explanation:** In 2001, Reading Is Fundamental will develop baseline data that report the percentage and number of children served and books distributed throughout the entire program, with percentage and number of children served and books distributed in partnerships with schools as a reportable subset. Baseline data will be available by January 2001.	*Next Update:* 2001.
2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Will use Standards for Evaluating Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Baseline data will not be available until 2001.

Indicator 1.2 After projects' first year of Federal funding, there will be an increase in the percentage and number of Federal projects for which the share of Federal funding decreases and the share of state, local, and other funding increases.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: Unable to judge.	Source: Performance reports.
1999:	**First data 2000**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:	Report September 2000	Baseline data	**Explanation:** In 2000, baseline data will be available to report on Federal, state, and local funding allocations. In 2000, Reading Is Fundamental will develop baseline data that report the levels of Federal, state, and local funding used to support individual projects.	*Next Update:* September 2000.
2001		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Will use Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Baseline data will not be available until 2000.

OBJECTIVE 2: SERVE CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS THROUGH READING IS FUNDAMENTAL (RIF) PROJECTS. CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS ARE DEFINED AS CHILDREN AT RISK OF SCHOOL FAILURE, DISABLED AND HOMELESS CHILDREN, CHILDREN OF MIGRANT FAMILIES, INSTITUTIONALIZED AND INCARCERATED CHILDREN, OR CHILDREN OF INSTITUTIONALIZED OR INCARCERATED PARENTS.

Indicator 2.1 Children with special needs: An increasing percentage of children served by RIF will be those with special needs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of children served who have special needs			**Status:** 1999 data show a gain of 1 percent since 1997. Target met.	**Source:** Performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* January 2001.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	67%			
1999:	**68%**	**68%**	**Explanation:** In 1999, approximately 68 percent of children served by Reading Is Fundamental projects had special needs. Reading Is Fundamental is serving increasing percentages of children with special needs.	**Validation Procedure:** Will use Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
2000:		69%		
2001:		70%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To ensure lasting financial independence and sufficiency, Reading Is Fundamental projects will broaden and strengthen community partnerships.
- To ensure coordination across Federal programs, Reading is Fundamental projects will coordinate efforts with local Title I, Migrant Education, Even Start, and America Reads Challenge: Read•Write•Now programs.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To reach underserved, at-risk, and special needs children, provide technical assistance and advice to RIF on effective practices.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Reading Is Fundamental coordinates activities with the National Head Start Association (DHHS) as well as Title I, Migrant Education, Even Start, and Reading Excellence programs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 has been adjusted for this year by requiring data on the percentage and number of children served and books distributed, and by adding a new segment for data on linking numbers of children served and books distributed to school-based programs only.
- Indicator 1.2 (financial self-sufficiency) and Indicator 1.3 (community literacy efforts) have been combined in this year's Indicator 1.2 to reduce numbers of indicators and strengthen the existing indicators.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.1 was dropped because the numbers of children served and books distributed is simply a function of the amount of money the program receives; thus the more money, the more children served and books distributed.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 has been added; last year's Indicator 1.2 is now 1.1.

Dropped--None.

New—None.

ARTS EDUCATION

Goal: To promote, improve, and enhance arts education and cultural activities for elementary and secondary students.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Arts in Education Program supports Objectives 1.1 (challenging standards) and 2.4 (at-risk populations). The program provides financial support for high-quality arts education that can help motivate all children, including members of high-risk groups, to learn to high standards.

FY 2000—$11,500,000

FY 2001—$23,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED WITH FEDERAL FUNDS WILL IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE OUTCOMES FOR PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.

Indicator 1.1 Outcomes: Increasing percentages of individuals who participate in *VSA Arts* national program activities and activities conducted by state affiliates will report to *VSA Arts* and its affiliates that these activities positively affected their quality of life outcomes.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Baseline to be established in 2000.	**Source:** Performance reports.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** A new indicator was developed in 1999 to better reflect outcome data.	*Next Update:* 2000.
2001:		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** To be determined.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There are no current data available in 2000. Performance reports rely on self-report.

OBJECTIVE 2: KENNEDY CENTER ACTIVITIES WILL IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF ARTS EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY PROVIDING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO SCHOOL STAFF.

Indicator 2.1 Quality of services: Increasing percentages of school staff participating in the Professional Development Opportunities for Teachers program will report they are very confident that they learned workshop content well enough to use it in their classrooms.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** 1999 is baseline year.	**Source:** Performance reports.
1999:	**55%**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		Continuing increase	**Explanation:** A new indicator was developed in 1999.	*Next Update:* 2000.
2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantee. No formal verification procedure applied.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The 55 percent of program participants who reported that they were very confident only represent one local program. The data are not nationally representative.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To provide technical assistance and advice to grantees on effective ways to reach students who are underserved, at risk, and have special needs.
- To provide information to grantees about effective teacher training practices.
- To provide arts education resources, developed by grantees, to schools through the use of technology.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To address the lack of nationally representative data, the program will work with the Kennedy Center to develop an indicator and collect information on activities on a national basis.
- To provide data for Indicator 1.1, the program will work with VSA Arts to collect national information on an annual basis.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The program plans and coordinates activities with the National Endowment for the Arts. The program office will work with Budget Service and the Planning and Evaluation Service to ensure that grantees that receive competitive awards will collect and report on national outcomes on an annual basis.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years ago)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Objective 1 was modified and its indicators were dropped.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.1, 1.2, and 2.1 were dropped as they focused solely on participant counts and not program outcomes.

New—None

MAGNET SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Goal: To assist in the desegregation of schools served by local educational agencies.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Magnet Schools Assistance Program supports Objectives 1.1 (states develop challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects), 1.6 (greater public school choice will be available to students and families), and 3.1 (secondary school students get the information, skills, and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education) of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides financial assistance for high-quality public school choice options that are accessible to all children. The objectives are concerned with how well the program is serving the children enrolled in magnet schools and the extent to which the program is enabling public school districts to reduce racial isolation among and within schools. The program contributes to state and local systemic reforms, the provision of high-quality teaching and learning experiences, and the improvement of student achievement.

FY 2000—$110,000,000

FY 2001—$110,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: FEDERALLY FUNDED MAGNET PROGRAMS ELIMINATE, REDUCE, OR PREVENT THE INCIDENCE AND THE DEGREE OF MINORITY STUDENT ISOLATION IN TARGETED SCHOOLS.

Indicator 1.1 Minority group isolation: Increasing numbers of targeted schools will *eliminate*, *reduce*, or *prevent* minority group isolation according to their individual objective.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of targeted schools meeting their objective			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Magnet Schools Assistance Program annual performance reports; Magnet Schools Assistance Program Evaluation.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1998:	Data not yet available		**Explanation:** For 1998 grantees, it is not possible to determine the number of targeted schools meeting their desegregation objective until enrollment data are available from the 1998-99 school year—the first year of this grant cycle. This data was reported in the year 1 performance reports (summer 1999). However, because these data are self-reported and not standardized, they must be compared to the enrollment data in the National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data (CCD). Data for the 1998-99 school year from the CCD are lagged and will not be available until the fall of 2000. Specific objectives of FY 1998-funded schools: 11 percent of schools—prevent minority group isolation (MGI); 13 percent of schools—eliminate MGI; 57 percent of schools—reduce MGI; 3 percent of schools—prevent, reduce, or eliminate MGI in feeder school; 16 percent of schools—other.	*Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Not applicable. **Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements:** Student recruitment activities (the primary tool to meet desegregation objectives) generally occur in the spring. Since the first year grant award was made in the summer of 1998, it was too late to be used for initial recruitment. Impact of the grant on recruitment will not be seen until the second year of the grant (as reported in the year 2 performance report, summer 2000). Enrollment data from grantee performance reports have several limitations: (a) enrollment figures are self-reported; (b) grantees do not all use the same month (e.g., October) to collect enrollment data; and (c) grantees sometimes report enrollment figures at different times each year (e.g., October for the first year, May for the next).
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**No specific target set**		
2000:		Continuing increase of schools that meet their objective		
2001:		Continuing increase		

OBJECTIVE 2: FEDERALLY FUNDED MAGNET PROGRAMS OR INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS STRENGTHEN STUDENTS' KNOWLEDGE OF ACADEMIC SUBJECTS AND SKILLS NEEDED FOR SUCCESSFUL CAREERS IN THE FUTURE.

Indicator 2.1 Improved student achievement: Students will show achievement gains in core subjects, as well as in applied learning skills, that meet or exceed the gains for students in the district as a whole.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of targeted schools meeting their objective			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Analysis of 1998 Magnet Schools Assistance Program applications; Magnet Schools Assistance Program annual performance reports; Magnet Schools Assistance Program Evaluation.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	Data not yet available		**Explanation:** Performance data are not yet available for the 1998-99 or 1999-00 school years. Virtually none of the 1998 applications provided 1997-98 baseline data because scores had not been released at the time the application was submitted. Similarly, when the first year performance reports were submitted in 1999, year 1 results were unavailable; having no year 1 scores for comparison, most grantees did not report baseline data (1997-98) either.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**No specific target set**		**Validation Procedure:** Not applicable.
2000:		Continuing increase		**Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements:** Not applicable.
2001:		Continuing increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Provide technical assistance to grantees on the integration and use of the performance indicators in applications and reports.
- Disseminate information on best practices and strategies for achieving program objectives through conferences and meetings.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To improve performance where magnet project reports indicate real or potential problems in reaching planned objectives, staff from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program will follow up with grantees regarding their plans.
- Identify and disseminate new and promising strategies for the recruitment and selection of students that minimize or eliminate the need to use race as a criterion in student selection processes for magnet schools.
- In order to have a more structured information management system, the Magnet School Assistance Program office will continue to use the data base created for the current evaluation to track grantee performance data.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To ensure that school districts receive timely and consistent information about magnet school strategies, technical assistance is provided by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program in collaboration with the Equity Assistance Centers.
- In order to further the goal of increasing public school choice, both the Magnet Schools Assistance Program and the Public Charter Schools Program are administered from the same organizational unit.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Many school districts are continuing to experience disproportionate growth in minority group student enrollment, making it more difficult to reduce, eliminate, or prevent minority group isolation within the school districts.
- There are few incentives and many barriers (political, social, and financial) to regional or interdistrict approaches to reducing, eliminating, or preventing minority group isolation.
- Changing legal standards constrict school districts' ability to use race as a criterion in selecting students to attend magnet programs.
- More teachers are needed with the skills to effectively teach in classrooms with children from diverse ethnic, economic, and educational backgrounds.
- The Magnet Schools Assistance Program does not have an information management system that can aggregate grantee performance reports or provide data on the program as a whole.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 (minority group isolation) was adjusted. The second part of the indicator (magnet programs will not have a significant adverse impact on the racial composition of feeder schools) was dropped so that in the FY 2000 plan, only the first part of the indicator (targeted schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation according to their objective) remained.

Dropped

- Objective 3 (Federally funded magnet programs feature innovative educational methods) was dropped.
- Indicators 3.1 (innovative themes), 3.2 (innovative educational methods and practices), and 4.2 (vocational skills) were also dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Objectives 2 (systemic reform and aligning standards) and 4 (innovative programs assist in desegregation) have been dropped.
- Indicator 1.2 (minority/nonminority distribution) is being dropped because there is no direct correlation between it and the statutory purposes of the program.
- Indicator 2.2 (national, state, and local reforms) is being dropped because the evidence provided by grantees in the progress reports regarding this indicator is descriptive in nature and varies widely. Performance data are therefore weak because they are self-reported and not quantifiable.
- Indicator 2.3 (state content and performance standards) is being dropped for the same reason as Indicator 2.2 above.
- Indicator 4.1 (assist in desegregation) is being dropped for several reasons: (a) this part of the MSAP program only receives 5 percent of MSAP funding and is therefore not a key indicator of the program; (b) the data necessary to inform this indicator are not quantifiable; (c) data on innovative programs would best be described in an evaluation; however, no evaluations of this part of the MSAP have been conducted and there are no future plans to do so.
- Indicator 4.2 (parental and community involvement) is being dropped for the same reason as Indicator 4.1 above.
- New—None.

STEWART B. MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as is provided to other children and youth.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This program is designed to increase homeless children and youths' access to public education and educational support services by requiring that states remove barriers to their participation. It addresses the Department's Objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards).

FY 2000—$28,800,000

FY 2001—$31,700,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH WILL HAVE GREATER ACCESS TO A FREE AND APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION.

Indicator 1.1 Public schools: An increasing percentage of homeless children and youth will enroll in public schools and will attend school regularly.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of homeless children and youth enrolled in grades K-12, as reported by states

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996-97:	78%	
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**
1999-00:		No target set
2000-01:		82%

Percentage of homeless children and youth in grades K-12 attending school, as reported by states

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996-97:	55%	
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**
1999-00:		No target set
2000-01:		59%

Assessment of Progress

Status: There are no 1999 data available, but progress toward the target is likely.

Explanation: We have not had consistent data on attendance in the past, making it difficult to judge progress. However, there has been a positive trend in enrollment since the inception of the program.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Triennial State Data Collection Report, 1998.
Frequency: Every 3 years.
Next Update: 2001.

Validation Procedures: Internal procedures were applied by telephone calls to State Educational Agencies (SEAs).

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: States' data are often incomplete and inconsistent. Reauthorization would shift the data collection requirements from the SEAs to the Secretary.

Indicator 1.2 An increasing number of homeless children and youth will have access to all Federal programs and state-sponsored academic programs.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of states reporting increased access to Title I

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997-98:	29	
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**
1999-00:		No target set
2000-01:		31

Number of states reporting increased access to special education

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997-98:	14	
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**
1999-00:		No target set
2000-01:		16

Assessment of Progress

Status: There are no 1999 data available, but progress toward the target is likely.

Explanation: Prior data collections and evaluations show that there has been progress toward meeting this goal since the inception of the program. It is likely that this trend will continue in the future.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Unpublished tabulations, followup to the National Evaluation, 1998.
Frequency: Uncertain.
Next Update: None planned.

Validation Procedures: The contractor applied internal verification procedures.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Reauthorization would shift the data collection requirements from the SEAs to the Secretary. The Department plans to include all reporting requirements in one data collection activity.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states reporting increased access to Head Start				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997-98:	16			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
1999-00:		No target set		
2000-01:		18		

Indicator 1.3 Eliminating barriers: Decreasing numbers of states will report transportation, immunization, and residency requirements as barriers to access to education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** There are no 1999 data available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** Prior data collections and evaluations show that there has been progress toward meeting this goal since the inception of the program. It is likely that this trend will continue in the future.	**Source:** Unpublished tabulations, follow-up to the National Evaluation, 1998. *Frequency:* Uncertain. *Next Update:* None planned. **Validation Procedures:** The contractor applied verification procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as 1.2.
1997-98:	In 1998, 6 states reported that immunization requirements still pose a barrier, 13 states reported that requirements for legal guardianship still pose a barrier, and 18 states reported that transportation still poses a barrier to the enrollment of homeless children and youth.			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
1999-00:	No data available	No target set		
2000-01:		4 states report immunization poses a barrier, 11 states report guardianship poses a barrier, 16 states report transportation poses a barrier.		

Indicator 1.4 Preschool-age children: An increasing percentage of preschool-age homeless children will enroll in preschool programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** 1998 was the first year that data were reported.	**Source:** Triennial State Data Collection Report, 1998. *Frequency:* Uncertain. *Next Update:* None planned. **Validation Procedures:** Internal procedures were applied by telephone calls to SEAs. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as Indicator 1.2
1997-98:	In 1998, states reported that 21% of homeless preschool age children are enrolled in preschool programs.			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
1999-00:	No data available	No target set		
2000-01:		25% of homeless preschool age children are enrolled in preschool programs.		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Promote state awareness of the need to improve access to education for homeless children by encouraging the Title I and homeless program coordinators to work together.
- Disseminate successful practices through national conferences, regional meetings, publications, and site visits.
- Disseminate information and guidance on the statutory requirement that preschool-age children have access to appropriate services.
- The Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers (CCs) will provide technical assistance to states and districts in developing and implementing plans to increase the achievement of homeless children and youth.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Require state homeless program coordinators to ensure that school districts have designated local homeless liaison personnel.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Coordination activities occur through the Interagency Council on Homelessness and through working closely with the Title I program. The program disseminates copies of the Head Start booklets.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Only a small portion of funds is made available as subgrants to LEAs, making it difficult to directly impact on the education of homeless children.
- Obtaining reliable data from states on homeless children continues to be a challenge since states are not required to report disaggregated data on homeless children.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1: Performance measure on regular school attendance was added.
- Indicator 2.1: To clarify the measure of performance, "increasing numbers of LEAs report collecting achievement data" was changed to "increasing numbers of states report on effective school district activities to help homeless children and youth meet challenging standards."
- Indicator 3.1: To clarify the measure of performance, "increasing numbers of states report on useful coordination to encourage Federal, state, and local policy makers and administrators to improve homeless services" was changed to "increasing numbers of states report on coordination among state agencies."

Dropped

- Indicator 2.2 (increasing numbers of LEAs report that performance of homeless children and youth is improving) was dropped because state systems are unable to disaggregate this data.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1 (increase in numbers of states reporting effective school district activities to help homeless children and youth meet challenging standards) has been dropped because state systems are unable to disaggregate this data.
- Indicator 3.1 (increasing numbers of states report on coordination among state agencies) has been dropped because it is not an outcome measure of the program.

New—None.

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY ASSISTANCE (WEEA)

Goal: To promote equity in education for women and girls in the United States.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Women's Educational Equity Assistance Program objectives support Objective 1.1 (states develop challenging standards) of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides financial assistance and information that will help ensure that girls and women receive equitable opportunities to receive high-quality instruction and to learn to high standards and achieve success without encountering gender bias.
FY 2000—$3,000,000
FY 2001—$3,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROMOTE GENDER EQUITY IN EDUCATION TO ENSURE THAT GIRLS AND WOMEN HAVE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES COMPARABLE TO THOSE AVAILABLE TO BOYS AND MEN.

Indicator 1.1 LEA implementation: Increasing numbers of requests by LEAs, SEAs, postsecondary institutions, and community education programs for gender equity information and resources will be received.

Targets and Performance Data

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
Requests by LEAs		
FY 1999:	**245**	**200**
FY 2000:		Continuing increase
FY 2001:		Continuing increase
Requests by SEAs		
FY 1999:	**128**	**110**
FY 2000:		Continuing increase
FY 2001:		Continuing increase
Requests by Postsecondary		
FY 1999:	**244**	**225**
FY 2000:		Continuing increase
FY 2001:		Continuing increase
Requests by other programs		
FY 1999:	**19,000**	**15,000**
FY 2000:		Continuing increase
FY 2001:		Continuing increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Baseline was established in 1999; continuing increase is likely.

Explanation: Numbers reflect total gender equity requests received for each educational entity.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Performance reports; WEEA Resource Center Report.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedures: Data to be supplied by grantee. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are self-reported.

OBJECTIVE 2: PROMOTE TRAINING ACTIVITIES THAT PREPARE EDUCATORS TO MEET THE NEEDS OF WOMEN AND GIRLS, INCLUDING THOSE WHO SUFFER FROM MULTIPLE FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION (I.E., SEX, RACE, ETHNIC ORIGIN, LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY, DISABILITY, OR AGE).

Indicator 2.1 Training strategies: Increasing numbers of educators served by the program will receive gender equity training, including training that deals with multiple forms of discrimination.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Conferences			**Status:** Baseline was established in 1999; continuing increase is likely. **Explanation:** The figures include the number of participants served through conferences sponsored by the Center; estimated number of educators at each forum; number of on-line course participants; and number of training sessions sponsored by the Center's associates/partners.	**Source:** Performance reports; WEEA Resource Center Report. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data to be supplied by grantee. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Currently, only the Resource Center reports this information. It is not collected and compiled by other grantees. Performance report format will be revised and all grantees will report data relating to this indicator.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1999:	**100**	**80**		
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
Forums				
FY 1999:	**100**	**75**		
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
On-line courses				
FY 1999:	**30**	**30**		
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
Associates				
FY 1999:	**8**	**6**		
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- School Improvement Program (SIP) staff will coordinate with the Resource Center to disseminate current gender equity materials and resources and to provide technical assistance on their use.
- SIP staff will coordinate with the WEEA Resource Center to disseminate information on effective training techniques and promising practices for equity in education. SIP will include training as a competitive priority in future grant applications.

New or Strengthened Strategies

None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To promote gender equity and strengthen services, this program coordinates with various Federal programs and offices, including the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse, the Title IV Equity Assistance Centers, and the Office for Civil Rights.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Because of limited size and scope, it is difficult to attribute gains in gender equity to the program.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years ago)

Adjusted

❖ Indicator 1.1 has been revised to better reflect the work of the WEEA Resource Center. Indicator 2.1 has been revised to better reflect the work of the grantees.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

TRAINING AND ADVISORY SERVICES
(TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT: EQUITY ASSISTANCE CENTERS PROGRAM)

Goal: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, gender, and national origin.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Equity Assistance Centers Program objectives support Objectives 1.1 (states develop challenging standards), 1.6 (school choice), and 2.4 (special populations) of the Department's Strategic Plan. The centers funded by the program provide technical assistance designed to help school districts ensure that all students have equitable opportunities to learn to high standards regardless of their race, ethnicity, or gender.
FY 2000—$7,334,000
FY 2001—$7,334,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING TO PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ADDRESSING EQUITY IN EDUCATION.

Indicator 1.1 Addressing educational problems: An increasing percentage of school districts served by the Equity Assistance Centers will develop, implement, and/or improve their policies and practices on the following topics: (Topic 1:) eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence; (Topic 2:) addressing the educational needs of students based on race, national origin, and gender; and (Topic 3:) using equitable assessment and student placement procedures.

	Topic 1		Topic 2		Topic 3		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Performance Target	**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Project Performance Report, 2000.
1999:	**No data available**	**Not applicable**	**No data available**	**No target set**	**No data available**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** 1999-00 is the first year of the new grant cycle, and therefore baseline data will be established within this time frame.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001.
2000:		Not applicable		Not applicable		Not applicable		**Validation Procedures:** Data supplied by the individual Equity Assistance Center projects. No formal verification procedure applied.
2001:		Baseline set		Baseline set		Baseline set		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The program faces a challenge in collecting reliable data in that the Equity Assistance Centers were not required to use a uniform reporting system to collect data. In the second year of the program a uniform method of collecting and reporting data will be established with assistance from the Department.

243

242

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Conduct timely communication of ED information regarding strategies to ensure that all students have opportunities to meet high standards.
- Encourage districts implementing school choice and other programs to consider assistance that is available from Equity Assistance Centers in the formulation of their strategies to improve equality of student access and involvement in high-quality instructional programs.
- Disseminate information and provide regular updates from Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Office of the General Council (OGC), and other appropriate sources on issues regarding equity in education.
- SIP staff will work with the Equity Assistance Centers on the use of a survey.
- Create or expand both regional and national networks of technical assistance providers through joint meetings and other activities.
- Maintain lists of all technical assistance providers on ED Web site.
- Invite other technical assistance providers to meetings of Equity Assistance Center directors to expand directors' knowledge of resources and mandates of the other technical assistance providers.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Collaborate with the Equity Assistance Centers and the Office for Civil Rights in addressing desegregation and unitary status issues (minority group isolation).

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Coordinate services with Office for Civil Rights, Department of Labor, Department of Justice, Eisenhower Math and Science Consortia, Federal Indian Even Start Program, Regional Comprehensive Assistance Centers, Regional Educational Laboratories, Educational Technology Consortium, Women's Educational Equity Assistance (WEEA) Resource Center.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- To address limitations in data collection, the Department will work closely with the Centers to obtain additional data in FY 2000-01 to define need as well as capacity in school districts directly related to intervention of services from the Equity Assistance Centers. Also, consideration should be given to the amount of funding, which is relatively small given the societal significance of the program.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years ago)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 (address educational problems) was adjusted with 1.2 to more accurately reflect the program goal.
- Indicator 1.2 (training in capacity building) was adjusted with 1.1 to more accurately reflect the program goal.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1 (collaboration with other technical assistance providers) has been dropped because it was not an outcome indicator (see coordination of activities for updates of activities). New strategy is to enhance cooperation with other Federal programs that deal with the Civil Rights Act (CRA) to fit in with civil rights activities.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1 (collaboration with other technical assistance providers) has been dropped because it was not an outcome indicator (see coordination of activities for updates of activities). New strategy is to enhance cooperation with other Federal programs that deal with the Civil Rights Act (CRA) to fit in with civil rights activities.

New—None.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Goal: To improve participants' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the three branches of government.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Ellender Fellowship program objectives support Objective 1.1 of the Strategic Plan. The program provides fellowships to students from low-income families and their teachers to enable them to participate in seminars on government and current events. The program seeks to increase students' knowledge and skills in civic participation.

FY 2000—$1,500,000

FY 2001—$0 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM TO INCREASE STUDENTS' KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS IN CIVIC PARTICIPATION, WITH EMPHASIS ON STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.

Indicator 1.1 Students from targeted groups: Each year, an increasing percentage of participants will be students with special needs (e.g., those with disabilities, ethnic minorities, and migrants).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Grantee analysis of internal records, 1999.
1999:	**33%**	**Continuous improvement**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		36%	**Explanation:** One out of three participants is a student with special needs.	*Next Update:* September 30, 2000.
2001:		38%		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantee. No formal verification procedure applied.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: For the 1999–2000 program year, a new statistical model will be implemented that will allow the foundation to acquire more precise demographic information about all student participants, including Ellender Fellowship recipients.

Indicator 1.2 Student knowledge: Students will demonstrate an increased understanding of the democratic process.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Teacher ratings of programs as achieving or exceeding goals			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Grantee analysis of student and teacher surveys, 1999.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**Continuous improvement**	**Explanation:** First data available in FY 2001.	*Next Update:* September 30, 2000.
FY 2000:		90%		
FY 2001:		90%		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantee. No verification procedure applied.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: For the 1999–2000 year, a new instrument will be implemented that will allow the Foundation to acquire more precise information about changes in participating students' attitudes (including Ellender Fellowship recipients) toward the foundation's program and their understanding of the democratic process. The indicator will be modified as data on student knowledge and attitudes become available.

OBJECTIVE 2: MAKE PROGRESS TOWARD FULL FINANCIAL INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL FUNDING.

Indicator 2.1 Increased private funding: An increasing amount of grantees' funding that is allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students will come from non-Federal sources.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Source:** Annual audit and grantee's analysis of internal financial documents, 1999.
FY 1999:	**$865,000**	**Continuing increase**		
FY 2000:		$906,000	**Explanation:** First draft available in FY 2001.	*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2001:		$955,000		*Next Update:* September 30, 2000.
				Validation Procedure: Data from audited program records.
				Limitations of Planned Improvements: The $865,000 figure represents funds raised by the foundation and allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Disseminate information about the program to states and school districts in rural areas and small towns and to providers of technical assistance.
- Encourage grantees to allocate more student fellowships to schools with high proportions of students with special needs.
- Work with grantees to develop and refine plans for obtaining funding from non-Federal sources.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Program coordinates on an ongoing basis with several Federal agencies, as well as with the judiciary and legislative branches.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Providing adequate outreach and fellowships for students from low-income families and their teachers.

248

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2 for outreach to schools will be a program strategy.
- Indicator 2.1 for teacher use of program materials will be a program strategy.
- Indicator 2.2 for increased teacher use of information and strategies from grantees' professional development programs will be a program strategy.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 3.1 has changed percentage of total funding to amount of private funding to provide more accurate trend data.

Dropped

- Objective 2 and Indicator 2.1 FY 2000 will be used for internal management purposes.

New—None.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

Goal: To assist the Native Hawaiian population to achieve to challenging standards through supporting supplemental programs that meet their unique needs.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Education for Native Hawaiians program supports Objectives 1.1 and 2.4 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides assistance for educational services that meet the special needs of Native Hawaiian children and families so that these children can learn to high standards.

FY 2000—$23,000,000

FY 2001—$23,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: NATIVE HAWAIIAN STUDENTS WILL ENTER SCHOOL READY TO LEARN AND ACHIEVE TO HIGH STANDARDS.

Indicator 1.1 Children's school readiness: An increasing percentage of Native Hawaiian children will improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Total statewide enrollment for Native Hawaiian students in kindergarten: 1998-99			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Native Hawaiian Data Book, 1998. *Frequency:* Undetermined. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** The data presented represent early childhood participation data for Native Hawaiian students statewide. No data are available on students currently participating in the program. However, we know that in 1997–98, approximately 3,000 Native Hawaiian students participated in curriculum and instructional programs supported by the program.	**Validation Procedure:** Data provided by Kamehameha Schools, Bernice Pauahi Bishop Estate; Office of Program Evaluation and Planning, Native Hawaiian Educational Assessment, 1993; and Hawaiian students in the Hawaii State Department of Education, 1998–99.
1998–1999:	**3,986***	**Not applicable**		
1999–2000:		Continuing increase		
2000–2001:		Continuing increase		
*Honolulu, 16.62%; Central, 12.33%; Leeward, 28.25%; Windward, 39.71%; Hawaii, 42.72%; Maui, 32.64%; Kauai, 34.19%. Total number of students: 3,986.				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvement:** The currently available measures of performance do not measure the quality of the program or student outcomes.

OBJECTIVE 2: TEACHERS WILL RECEIVE TRAINING AND HAVE ACCESS TO INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES THAT MEET THE UNIQUE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF NATIVE HAWAIIAN STUDENTS.

Indicator 2.1 Professional development: Teachers participating in the program will report improved knowledge, skills, and abilities in addressing the unique educational needs of Alaska Native students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. No 1999 data available.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1997–1998:	500	**Not applicable**	**Explanation:** The program performance indicators were included in the application package for new grantees in 1999. The seven 1999 program grantees are expected to report progress on these indicators in FY 2000 annual performance reports.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
1998–1999:	**No data available**	**Not applicable**		
1999–2000:		Continuing increase		
2000–2001:		Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvement: The currently available measures of performance do not measure the quality of the professional development activities.

OBJECTIVE 3: NATIVE HAWAIIAN STUDENTS WILL HAVE ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

Indicator 3.1 Undergraduate enrollment and completion: Increasing percentage of Native Hawaiian students will attend and complete postsecondary institutions in comparison with historic trends for the Native Hawaiian population.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The program performance indicators were included in the application package for new grantees in 1999. The seven 1999 program grantees are expected to report progress on these indicators in FY 2000 annual performance reports.	**Source:** Native Hawaiian Data Book, 1998. *Frequency:* Undetermined. *Next Update*: 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Hawaii State, University of Hawaii, Institutional Research Office, Fall Enrollment Report, 1998, and Degrees and Certificates Earned. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvement:** None.
	Total Enrollment (Community Colleges)	# Students Enrolled	# Degrees Earned			
1997–1998:	16.7%	4,118	781	**Not applicable**		
1998–1999:	**No data available**			**Not applicable**		
1999–2000:				Continuing increase		
2000–2001:				Continuing increase		

Percentage of Native Hawaiian students attending the University of Hawaii community college system and campus, Fall 1998: Honolulu,15.6%; Kapi'olani, 10.9%; Leeward, 13.3%; Windward, 28.5%; Hawaii, 29.3%; Kauai, 19.8%; Maui, 22.5%.

Enrollment of Native Hawaiians in the University of Hawaii System: 1996, 4.4%; 1997, 1.8%; 1998, 1.0%.

Number of Native Hawaiian students who earned degrees in the University of Hawaii System, all campuses: 1995–1996: 826; 1996–1997: 777; 1997–1998: 781.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Program staff will share promising models, approaches, and research with Native Hawaiian projects.
- Program staff will help facilitate networking among schools, Native Hawaiian education organizations, and resource centers to address the needs of Native Hawaiian students.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Program included performance indicator measures in the grantee applications for 1999 so that high-quality data can be collected on this program from future grantee reports.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Program staff will share information on effective parent involvement models and approaches from Title I and other Department of Education programs.
- Program will work with OPE to provide information on counseling, support services, and other promising activities that meet the needs of at-risk students and encourage their inclusion in postsecondary programs

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- This is a small program that serves a small percentage of the target population.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicators 2.1 and 2.3 were dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Goal: To assist Alaska Native population to achieve to challenging standards through supporting supplemental programs that meet their unique educational needs.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Alaska Native Education Program supports Objectives 1.1 and 2.4 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides financial assistance for educational services that meet the special needs of Alaska Native children and families so that these children can learn to high standards.

FY 2000—$13,000,000

FY 2001—$13,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ALASKA NATIVE STUDENTS WILL HAVE ACCESS TO INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULA THAT MEET THEIR UNIQUE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Indicator 1.1 Student achievement: An increasing percentage of Alaska Native students participating in the program will meet or exceed the performance standards in math and science that are established by the grantee.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Actual Performance An evaluation of three (Geophysical Institute, Aurora Alive, and Southeast Regional Resource Center) of the six programs funded under the Alaska Native Student Enrichment Program found that participating students showed an increase in performance on assessments in math and science. The Geophysical Institute provided data that indicated an average of 98 percent of the students participating in the Enrichment Program showed an increase of scores within educational units designed to assess science and math skills before and then after the Enrichment Program. The Aurora Alive Student Enrichment Program reported during the second year of the program that 100 percent of the students participating in each of the four units (Aurora Legends, Magnet Earth, Powerful Sun, and Aurora Light) demonstrated an increase in knowledge of the physics of the aurora. Southeast Regional Research Center reported 151 seventh and eighth grade students from 69 different villages attended project classes taught by recognized content and cultural experts. Students participating in the program demonstrated a broad range of ability related to general cognition and/or specific science knowledge and skills.	**Status:** No previous targets set. Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Three of the six Alaska Native Student Enrichment Programs are new projects and will report progress in the 2000 grantee performance report.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports, Alaska Native Student Enrichment Program, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported by grantee. There is no consistent measure of achievement across funded projects.

Year	Performance Targets
1999:	**No target set**
2000	Continuing increase in math and science performance for Alaska Native students
2001	Continuing increase

Indicator 1.2 Professional development: Teachers participating in the program will report improved knowledge, skills, and abilities in addressing the unique educational needs of Alaska Native students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No previous targets set. Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Program is focused on providing professional development to teachers in rural areas. However, we are not able to measure the extent to which the professional development leads to improved performance in the classroom.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports, Alaska Native Educational Planning, Curriculum Development, and Teacher Training Program, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* June 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This indicator is not an assessment of teacher knowledge and does not measure the quality of professional development activities. The data will be improved by encouraging grantees to develop and collect teacher evaluations/teacher response surveys to evaluate professional development activities.
1999:	**Approximately 70***	**Not available**		
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		

*Approximately 70 teachers participated in professional development/teacher training activities under this program. These programs prepared teachers to teach their subjects in the native language as well as English, to address the unique needs of Native children, and to impart the native language, culture, and values to their students.

OBJECTIVE 2: PARENTS OF ALASKA NATIVE PRESCHOOL STUDENTS WILL BECOME MORE EFFECTIVE EDUCATORS THROUGH ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT IN THEIR CHILDREN'S EDUCATION.

Indicator 2.1 Parent involvement: The number of parents reporting improved ability to teach their children will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No previous targets set. Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Grantee is required to complete an evaluation of the Home Based Education for Preschool Children Program in FY 2000. Data will be available in 2000 and 2001.	**Source:** Grantee evaluation of Alaska Native Home Based Education for Preschool Children Program, 2000. *Frequency:* One time. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applies. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Grantee is required to submit an evaluation of the program. Data that are supplied after the participants start school could be better measured to see if parent involvement continues as children enter school.
1999:	**No data available**	**Not available**		
2000:		Baseline		
2001:		Continuing Increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Program staff will seek approval to change or modify the U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report form to correctly align the requested information with the indicators.
- Program staff will provide information to help facilitate networking among schools, Alaska Native education organizations, and resource centers to address the needs of Alaska Native students.
- Program staff will share promising models, approaches, and research with Alaska Native projects.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Coordinate with Title I to gain access to assessment data and encourage disaggregated data for Alaska Native student achievement.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Disaggregated data regarding Alaska Native student achievement are not available.
- The Alaska Native student population is 30,782; this program is serving less than 5 percent of this population.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Objectives 1.1 and 2.2 were dropped because they were not key indicators.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was changed to include only participants in the program and performance in math and science.

Dropped

- Support services. Increasing percentages of Alaska Native enrichment programs will provide support services to families. The program does not consider this a key indicator.

New—None.

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools and evaluate their effects.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Public Charter Schools Program objectives support Objective 1.6 of the Department's Strategic Plan (greater public school choice will be available to all students and families). Public Charter Schools Program objectives seek to expand the number and variety of options available for families. The program also strives to improve the quality and accountability of those options, while working to increase positive impacts on the public school system. The program goal is to increase the numbers of charter schools and ensure that these schools have adequate flexibility, are held accountable for reaching high standards, and are open to all students.

FY 2000—$145,000,000

FY 2001—$175,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LARGE NUMBER OF HIGH-QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS THAT ARE FREE FROM STATE OR LOCAL RULES THAT INHIBIT FLEXIBLE OPERATION, ARE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR ENABLING STUDENTS TO REACH CHALLENGING STATE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, AND ARE OPEN TO ALL STUDENTS.

Indicator 1.1 State legislation: By 2000, 40 states will have charter school legislation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)			**Status:** Positive move toward 2000 target. **Explanation:** There has been a positive trend toward meeting this objective, which was set by the president of the United States. The number of states (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) with charter school legislation has risen from 12 in 1994 to 38 in 1999.	**Source:** State Educational Agencies SEA; state legislatures. *Frequency:* Quarterly. *Next Update:* Summer 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by State Educational Agencies SEAs and state legislatures. Data validated by ED staff and corroborated by information from other sources. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** There is variation in the definition of state charter school legislation, which leads to uneven implementation.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1994–95:	12			
1995–96:	19			
1996–97:	27			
1997–98:	31			
1998–99:	**38**	**Continuous Improvement**		
1999–00:		40		
2000–01:		42		

Indicator 1.2 Charter operations: By 2002, there will be at least 3,000 charter schools in operation around the Nation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of charter schools in operation			**Status:** Positive movement toward 2002 target. **Explanation:** There has been a positive trend toward meeting this objective, which was set by the President of the United States. The number of charter schools in operation has dramatically increased from 100 in 1994 to 1,700 in 1999.	**Source:** State legislatures, SEAs. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Summer 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data verified by the U.S. Dept. of Education data quality attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Indicators.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1994–95:	100			
1995–96:	255			
1996–97:	428			
1997–98:	790			
1998–99:	1,100			
1999–00:	**1,700**	**2,060**		
2000–01:		2,667		
2001–02:		3,000		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charters, while others count them as multiple charters) cause variability in the counts State Educational Agencies SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.

Indicator 1.3 The percentage of charter schools reporting that the lack of start-up funds is a major obstacle to implementation will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of first-year charter schools reporting start-up funding as a major obstacle to implementation			**Status:** Positive move toward 2001 target. **Explanation:** Between 1996 and 1999, fewer charter schools reported start-up funding as a major barrier to implementation. During that time span, funding to the Public Charter School Program has increased, suggesting a possible correlation. A specific numerical target was set in 2001 and not 2000, because we will not have data on this indicator in 2000.	**Source:** National Study of Charter Schools (2000); National Evaluation of the Public Charter School Program (2001, 2002). *Frequency:* Periodically. *Next Update:* Second-year report of the National Evaluation, December 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Internal review procedures of an experienced data collection agency. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Continuity problems as a result of data collection under multiple studies. In fact, the survey that is responsible for school-level data in 1999–2000, the Schools and Staffing Survey, will not be capturing this data. Therefore, there will be no data for this indicator until December 2001. After the National Evaluation is completed in 2002, it will be difficult to collect this data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996:	59%			
1997:	55%			
1998:	51%			
1999:	**39%**	**Continuing decrease**		
2000:		Continuing decrease		
2001:		30%		

OBJECTIVE 2: IDENTIFY, EVALUATE, AND DISSEMINATE THE EFFECTS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS.

Indicator 2.1 Equity—impact of charters on educational opportunity: Nationally, students in charter schools will have similar demographic characteristics as students in all public schools.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of students, out of total student enrollment, for each demographic characteristic for both charter schools and all public schools in states with charter schools that year

Percent Minority

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Charter	All Public*	Charter	All Public* (see limitations)
1997:	48.2%	41.3%		
1998	51.8%	41%		
1999:	**No data available yet**		**Continuous closing of gap**	
2000:			45%	41% (est'd.)
2001:			Continuous closing of gap	

Free or Reduced-price Lunch Eligibility

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Charter	All Public*	Charter	All Public*
1997:	36.7%	37.6%		
1998:	38.7%	37.3%		
1999:	**No data available yet**		**Continuous closing of gap**	
2000:			37.3%	37.3% (est'd.)
2001:			Continuous closing of gap	

Students With Disabilities

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Charter	All Public*	Charter	All Public*
1997:	8.3%	11.2%		
1998:	8.4%	11.3%		
1999:	**No data available yet**		**Continuous closing of gap**	
2000:			10%	11.3% (est'd.)
2001:			Continuous closing of gap	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Percent Minority: No 1999 data available. Unable to judge whether progress toward target is likely.

Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility: No 1999 data available, but progress toward target is likely.

Students with Disabilities: No 1999 data available, but progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: The target is to have the percentage of charter school students (with one of the three characteristics) similar to that of students in all public schools.

Percent Minority: The percentage of minority students in charter schools has risen from 48 percent in 1997 to 52 percent in 1998; in all public schools, minority students have remained at about 41 percent. It is difficult to judge whether the target will be met, because the percentage of minority students in charter schools is variable and seems to be affected by the growth of charter schools within states.

Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility: In 1998, charter schools served a similar but slightly higher percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, as compared with all public schools (39 percent versus 37 percent).

Students with Disabilities: In both 1997 and 1998, charter schools enrolled a slightly lower proportion of students with disabilities than all public schools in the charter states (8 percent versus 11 percent).

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National Study of Charter Schools (1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000); Schools and Staffing Survey (1999); Evaluation of the Public Charter Schools Program (2000, 2001, and 2002).
Frequency: Periodically.
Next Update: 2001.

Validation Procedure: Internal review procedures of an experienced data collection agency.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The number of charter schools, students in charters, and states with charter schools increase each year.

* Note: Because data collection for all public schools lags behind data collection for charter schools, comparison data for all public schools are for a school year 1 to 3 years prior to the year for charter schools. There is also wide variation between states in charter and all public schools, as well as variation and potential concentration of students in individual charter schools. The Department hopes to update this indicator to better reflect the complexities of this issue in the field, after the publication of a forthcoming study examining equity issues in charter schools.

Indicator 2.2 Impact on student performance: Increasing numbers of charter schools will show improved student outcomes.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The first national-level study on student achievement in charter schools will be released in spring 2000.	**Source:** National Study of Charter Schools (2000); National Evaluation of the Public Charter Schools Program (2001, 2002). *Frequency:* Periodically. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** N/A. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** N/A (because there are no data).
1997	No data available			
1998	No data available			
1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		

Key Strategies

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Providing support and technical assistance for state and regional information and outreach meetings.
- Supporting a charter school Web site, including interactive forums and a national registry of charter schools, to provide information on common issues.
- Providing information about model charters and chartering processes for chartering agencies through documents and meetings.
- In order to discuss lessons learned about equity, performance accountability, effective management, leadership and partnerships, and cross-fertilization to nonchartered schools, the program is convening national conferences for Federal charter school grantees and others.
- Supporting studies of issues associated with charter schools, such as serving students with disabilities, assessment and accountability, fairness and equity, and school finance.
- Collecting and disseminating information on charter school models that promote student achievement and innovation in the public school system and support the development of networks among charter schools.
- Meeting with universities, museums, organizations that educate disadvantaged children, and others with the capacity to help charter schools in order to encourage their support in sponsoring and providing technical assistance to charter schools and potential developers of charter schools.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- In order to fuel more cooperation among charter schools and other public schools, the program is initiating dissemination grant opportunities for states and schools.
- Initiating a comprehensive needs assessment to direct future national activities—including focus groups with charter schools, charter developers, and charter authorizing agencies—in addition to convening federally funded researchers and demonstration projects.
- To increase accountability, the program is supporting networking and sharing of practices among chartering entities, recognizing that they influence the quality, accountability and equity in the charter school movement through their decisions.
- Publishing regulations regarding Federal formula funds that charter schools are eligible to receive.
- In order to see how to better administer grants, the Planning and Evaluation Service is conducting a program evaluation.
- To improve the way that states administer charter school programs, the program is supporting a series of regional workshops hosted by State Educational Agencies.
- In order to learn more about equity in charter schools, the program will sponsor a study on this issue.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- To ensure that all Federal agencies reflect the Department's support for charter schools, the Public Charter Schools Program incorporates other agencies into the national charter school conferences and other events. Agencies represented include the Department of Justice, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Agriculture.
- To ensure charter schools comply with civil rights obligations, the Public Charter Schools Program has collaborated with the Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, as well as the Department of Education's Office of General Council and Office for Civil Rights to draft guidance addressing civil rights issues.
- To ensure that charter schools receiving Federal funds operate as nonprofit organizations, and that nonprofit charter schools are not unduly burdened, the Public Charter Schools Program has worked with the Internal Revenue Service to streamline the examination of charter school applications by the Internal Revenue Service.
- To ensure that eligible charter schools can participate in school nutrition programs, the Public Charter Schools Program has worked with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide guidance and staff support.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Variations in state charter school laws and in procedures and oversight processes make it difficult to ensure quality in educational programs and complicate efforts to increase the quantity of charter schools.
- Some authorizing agencies fail to implement charter school oversight and accountability initiatives in ways that match program goals (e.g., they may not have adequate rigor in the review process, or may not ensure later accountability for performance).
- Public Charter Schools Program funds constitute a small proportion of total funding for charter schools.
- Other obstacles, in addition to the lack of start-up funds, hamper expansion and success in charters (e.g., lack of facilities, inadequate planning time, and organizational and governance challenges).

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.6 on educational approaches was adjusted to reflect student outcomes more generally (new Indicator 2.2).

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.3 and 1.4 replaced by new Indicator 1.3: The former Indicators 1.3 and 1.4 were created to take into account the changes to the Public Charter Schools Program under the Charter School Expansion Act of 1998. The old indicators were intended to reflect the flexibility and accountability that the amendments to the act were designed to support. Technical aspects of the grant competition made these indicators meaningless, as all participating states were required to comply with the areas measured. The revised Indicator 1.3 reduces the complexity of the indicators, captures the primary objective of the program, and can be accurately gauged.
- Objective 2 adjusted: Last year's Objective 2 read: "Evaluate the effects of charter schools, including identifying the most effective strategies to improve quality and innovation in the public school system." It now reads: "Identify, evaluate, and disseminate the effects of charter schools." The new language better reflects the 1998 reauthorized school legislation.
- Indicators 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 have been adjusted: These indicators are basically the same in substance but have been reworded and strengthened. Instead of indicators that state, "Studies will show," the new indicators focus on the performance of charter schools. While the purpose of the Public Charter Schools Program is not to impact charter school outcomes per se, the program does need to identify, evaluate, and disseminate the effects of charter schools (Objective 2).

Dropped

- Indicator 2.3 dropped: To truly determine the impact of charter schools on the public school system, one would need to get data from traditional public schools. The Public Charter Schools Program is dropping this indicator until future data sources can better inform an indicator like this one.

New

- Indicator 1.3 is new this year. It replaces last year's Indicators 1.3 and 1.4.

OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPROVE OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS PROGRAM (OPTIONS)

Goal: To identify and support innovative approaches to high-quality public school choice by providing financial assistance for the demonstration, development, implementation, evaluation of, and dissemination of information about public school choice projects that stimulate educational innovation for all public schools and contribute to standards-based school reform efforts.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The OPTIONS Program supports Objective 1.6 (greater public school choice will be available to students and families) of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program, if authorized, will provide financial assistance for high-quality public school choice options that are accessible to all children. The objectives address the need for a variety of innovative approaches to high-quality school choice in public schools, and how well the program promotes access to public school choice for all students.

FY 2001—$20,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: SUPPORT INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO HIGH-QUALITY PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE.

Indicator 1.1 There will be increasing varieties of public school choice programs offered to students and parents.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of students enrolled in participating public school choice programs:			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Proposed program—no source identified yet.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Not applicable.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**	**Explanation:** There are no data because this is a proposed program in the Administration's proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.	*Next Update:* Not applicable.
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Not applicable.
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		**Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements:** Not applicable.

OBJECTIVE 2: PROMOTE ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAMS FOR ALL STUDENTS.

Indicator 2.1 The number of students (including poor, minority, those with limited English proficiency, and those with disabilities) enrolled in public school choice programs will increase in participating states and districts.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of students enrolled in participating public school choice programs:			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Proposed program—no source identified yet.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Not applicable.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**	**Explanation:** There are no data because this is a proposed program in the Administration's proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.	*Next Update:* Not applicable.
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Not applicable.
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		**Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements:** Not applicable.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Provide support, information, and technical assistance through outreach meetings and the ED Web site.
- Support studies of public school choice programs and evaluations of the OPTIONS program.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Not applicable because this is a proposed program.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Not applicable because this is a proposed program.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT TEST INCENTIVE

Goal: To increase the numbers of low-income high school students prepared to pursue higher education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Advanced Placement program supports Objective 3.1 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program subsidizes the advanced placement test fees for low-income students to promote education excellence and equal access to higher education for these students.

FY 2000—$15,000,000

FY 2001—$20,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENCOURAGE A GREATER NUMBER OF LOW-INCOME STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAM.

Indicator 1.1 Students served: The number of AP tests taken by low-income students will increase by 10 percent annually (e.g., to 83,300 in 1999).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** In 1999 the performance goal was exceeded.	**Source:** College Board data on participation in Advanced Placement testing.
1999:	**92,750**	**83,3000**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		102,000		*Next Update:* 2000.
2001:		112,200	**Explanation:** In 1999, low-income students took 92,750 Advanced Placement tests.	**Validation Procedure:** Quality of data is monitored by College Board.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: No significant limitations of the data—no planned improvements.

KEY STRATEGIES

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Encourage increased access to challenging AP coursework, including the creation of new AP programs in disadvantaged areas.
- Develop an action plan for coordinating AP program activities with ED programs and initiatives—such as New American High Schools, Gear Up, and Trio—that work for schools that
- Conduct a national AP forum, in partnership with the College Board, to include state teams to ensure high-quality educational opportunities for our young people, especially low-income students, to enroll and succeed in advanced placement courses, to better prepare students in grades 8–10 to be ready for AP courses, and to offer a full set of quality AP courses.
- Disseminate information to the public about the availability of funding to pay for or to help pay for AP test fees.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Developing coordination activities with New American High Schools, Gear UP, TRIO, and other related programs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- While 34 states and D.C. participated in fiscal year 1999, some states have not shown an interest in participating in the program to increase the number of low-income students participating in the Advanced Placement program.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—Indicator 1.1 was adjusted to align with data being collected.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2, the number of districts participating in AP-test fee reduction, has been eliminated but remains part of the program strategy. The change was made because the indicator did not provide an adequate measure of the program's ongoing activities with states, districts, the College Board, and others to build familiarity with the program and effective use of program resources.

New—None.

STRENGTHENING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CAPACITY

COMPREHENSIVE CENTERS PROGRAM

Goal: To assist Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) recipients in improving teaching and learning for all children, particularly children at risk of educational failure.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Objective 1: High standards for all students are addressed in Indicators 1.1 – addressing legislative priorities, 1.2 – integrating technical assistance, 1.3 – addressing customer needs, and 1.4 – showing impact with customers.

FY 2000—$28,000,000

FY 2001—Funds for the Comprehensive Centers Program are being requested under the Strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity Program. The FY 2001 request for strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity Grants is $38,000,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY COMPREHENSIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES, TERRITORIES, TRIBES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND SCHOOLS THAT HELPS STUDENTS REACH HIGH ACADEMIC STANDARDS.

Indicator 1.1 Addressing legislative priorities: An increasing percentage of comprehensive center customers will be schoolwide programs, high-poverty schools, and Bureau of Indian Affairs-funded schools.

Targets and Performance Data

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Schoolwide Programs	High-poverty schools, non-schoolwide programs	BIA Schools	TOTAL	
1998:	50%	12%	4%	66%	
1999:	**44%**	**30%**	**3%**	**77%**	**80%**
2000:					80%
2001:					Program proposed to end September, 30, 2000

Assessment of Progress

Status: Positive movement toward the target.

Explanation: To provide a fuller understanding of the range of center customers, including the targeted customers in 1.1, the following explanation is presented:

Year	Services Targeted to:	Percent
1998:	Schools	50%
	State Agencies	12%
	Local School Districts	21%
	Others	17%
1999:	Schools	49%
	State Agencies	9%
	Local School Districts	27%
	Others	*15%*

"Others" included intermediate units, community-based organizations, universities, tribal entities, the Department of Education, and regional labs.

The legislation required the centers to provide services to state agencies and districts as well as schools. The centers have directed a large percentage of services to states and districts in response to requests for help in assisting high poverty programs, assessing needs, developing program plans for distributing funds, and conducting subsequent followup work at the local district and school levels.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Comprehensive Centers (CC) performance reports, including Data Tables, quarterly and annually 1998-99.
Frequency: Performance reports are now semi-annual (Jan. 30 and July 30), a 1999 change from previously required quarterly reports.
Next update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by project's uniform reporting system. No formal verification procedure applied to data collection, but data analysis validated by outside contractor.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Self-reported project-level data have been analyzed with assistance of an outside contractor. Data Tables specifications used in 1998 were not clear; they were more defined in 1999, resulting in more valid data. These same specifications will be used for the July 2000 performance reports.

Indicator 1.2 Integrating technical assistance: An increasing percentage of CC activities will provide integrated, noncategorical technical assistance (such as focusing on standards, assessment of special populations, reading, other challenging curricula, leadership development, and whole-school reform).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Noncategorical topics			**Status:** Target exceeded. **Explanation:** Examples of integrated activities that show the increased work in noncategorical services to schools, districts, and state agencies are The Reading Success Network, involving all of the centers; comprehensive school reform activities; and increased services for special populations.	**Source:** Performance reports 1999. *Frequency:* Semi-annual reports, submitted on January 30 and July 30 for analysis by an outside contractor. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by project's uniform reporting system. No formal verification procedure applied to data collection, but data analysis validated by outside contractor. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as 1.1.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	61%			
1999:	**75%**	**65%**		
2000:		68%		
2001:		Program proposed to end September 30, 2000		

Indicator 1.3 Addressing customer needs: An increasing percentage of state and local administrators served by the CCs will report satisfaction with the usefulness of technical assistance provided.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Satisfaction with usefulness of technical assistance			**Status:** Target exceeded. **Explanation:** The 1999 national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers reached district and school administrators, not just the state program administrators.	**Source:** 1999 Evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, conducted by an outside contractor. 1998 Follow-up Study of State Implementation of Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Programs, conducted by an outside contractor. *Frequency:* Biannual requirement. *Next Update:* None planned. Program proposed to end 9/30/00. **Validation Procedure:** 1998: Data validated by external contractor. 1999: Data validated by external, experienced evaluation contractor. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Customer satisfaction surveys are not planned for 2001.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	64% of state Federal-program administrators			
1999:	**79% of state and local administrators**	**65%**		
2000:		80%		
2001:		Program proposed to end September 30, 2000		

Indicator 1.4 Showing impact with customers: Participants in center activities report that they have incorporated information or skills they have learned from the Centers activities into their work.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New indicator added in 1999.	**Source:** 1999 Evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers.
1999:	**72%**	**Continuing increase**	**Explanation:** Customer satisfaction surveys conducted under the National Evaluation enabled the Department to collect, for the first time, impact data on customer application of what they learned from Center services.	*Frequency:* Biannual requirement.
2000:		75%		*Next Update:* None planned.
2001:		Program proposed to end September 30, 2000		Program proposed to end September 30, 2000.
				Validation Procedure: Data validated by external contractor.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Customer impact data are not planned in 2001.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Increase collaboration across the network of Comprehensive Centers on the Reading Success Network.
- Improve communication between ED and the CCs on statutory and OESE program priorities and initiatives, and encourage CCs to develop strategies to further objectives in ED Strategic Plan.
- Identify and disseminate models of technical assistance that are noncategorical and support coordination of programs.
- Create or expand regional and national networks of technical assistance providers through activities such as joint meetings of CCs and other service providers.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Evaluate the impact of the Reading Success Network on students, teachers, and schools.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The Comprehensive Center Program works to support and coordinate with all Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) programs and initiatives, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) programs, and all other Federal technical assistance providers, such as regional labs and state coalitions. Title I efforts, Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools programs are examples of work with other offices inside ED. Promoting effective early childhood, parental involvement, and safe schools results in coordination with other Federal agencies, such as Justice and Health and Human Services.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Funding to the centers has been substantially lower than originally anticipated. Since the centers' implementation in 1996, the funding has remained low, although the demands on and expectations of the centers have been great. The program office will continue to assist the centers in finding ways to target OESE/OBEMLA priorities without overextending their current agenda.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.4 (building capacity) was dropped because of the need to collect these data after a longer period of time, 4–5 years, for impact purposes.
- Indicator 1.5 (participating in ED Integrated Review Teams) was dropped because it was a process, not an outcome indicator.
- Indicator 2.1 (maintaining staff expertise) was dropped because it was a process, not an outcome indicator.
- Indicator 2.2 (collaborating with other technical assistance providers) was dropped because it was a process, not an outcome indicator.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New

- Indicator 1.4 (addressing customer needs) has been added to report important data from the comprehensive national evaluation, conducted by an outside contractor, on the impact of the Comprehensive Center's work. When the research study on the Reading Success Network is completed in spring 2000, the first student impact data, which is the most difficult linkage to validate with technical assistance, will be available.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STRENGTHENING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CAPACITY GRANTS

Goal: To assist Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) recipients in improving teaching and learning for all children, particularly children at risk of educational failure.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: To be determined.
FY 2001—$38,000,000 (Requested budget for proposed new program)

OBJECTIVE 1: TO SUPPORT A COMPREHENSIVE AND COHESIVE SYSTEM OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND DISSEMINATION THAT IS BASED ON RESPONDING TO LOCAL DEMAND FOR HIGH-QUALITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Indicator 1.1 Increasing percentages of ESEA Strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity Grant recipients will demonstrate that they have (1) implemented a system for coordinating their Federal, state, and local sources of funds for technical assistance, (2) aligned their technical assistance with state and local comprehensive improvement plans, and (3) targeted their technical assistance to high-poverty, low-performing LEAs and schools.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Not applicable	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Baseline to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 1.2 Increasing percentages of SEAs and LEAs receiving Strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity Grants will report that the Department's Consumer Information System is useful for accessing information regarding high-quality technical assistance.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Not applicable	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Baseline to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 1.3 Increasing percentages of recipients of services funded under the Strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity Grants Program will respond that the services they received were responsive to their needs and useful for guiding their reform efforts.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Not applicable	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Baseline to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- The system of Technical Assistance and Dissemination shall support states, LEAs, tribes, schools, and other recipients of funds under ESEA in implementing standards-based reform and improving student performance.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To be established.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- To be identified.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

New—Not applicable.

EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Goal: To improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program supports Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (every eighth-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting grants to states, districts, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations for standards-based professional development. The program places a priority on math and science professional development.

FY 2000—$335,000,000

FY 2001—Funds for the Eisenhower Professional Development Program are being requested under the Teaching to High Standards State Grants program. Total FY 2001 request is $690,000,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION IS IMPROVED THROUGH EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

Indicator 1.1 Teachers' knowledge and skills: Increasing percentages of teachers will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development improved their knowledge and skills.

Targets and Performance Data

Subject Area Content

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	
1998:	48%	68%	50%
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous increase**
2000:			60% for districts; 80% for SAHE grantees
2001:			Continuous increase

Instructional Methods

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	
1998:	63%	79%	50%
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous increase**
2000:			66% for districts; 83% for SAHE grantees
2001:			Continuous increase

Curriculum

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	
1998:	56%	64%	50%
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous increase**
2000:			60% for districts; 68% for SAHE grantees
2001:			Continuous increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data on knowledge and skills. Target for 1998 was met or close to being met for half the knowledge and skill areas.

Explanation: The program has met the target or is close to the target for areas emphasized in the legislation: math and science content, instructional methods, and curriculum. The grantees of the State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) place a greater emphasis on content knowledge and offer longer activities with more opportunities to observe and practice new instructional methods. SAHE grantees also spend an average of $512 per participant whereas districts spend an average of $185 of Eisenhower funds per participant.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999. (data collected in 1998.)
Frequency: Biannually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Verified by Department of Education attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The data on effects on knowledge and skills are self-reported by participants.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Approaches to Assessment					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	46%	48%	50%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous increase**		
2000:			60% for districts and SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous increase		
Use of Technology					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	24%	50%	50%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous increase**		
2000:			60% for districts and SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous increase		
Approaches to Diversity					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	26%	35%	50%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous increase**		
2000:			60% for districts and SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous increase		

Indicator 1.2 Teachers' classroom instruction: Increasing percentages of teachers in selected sites will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development improved their classroom instruction.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Professional development focused on having students recite or drill orally				**Status:** 1999 target not met.	**Source:** Unpublished data from the National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program. Data to be published in a report due out in 2000. *Frequency:* One time. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	No data available			**Explanation:** According to preliminary data from the evaluation, the program did not meet the performance target for any of the areas of practice. For example, over the period 1996-97 to 1998-99, 40 percent of teachers who participated in any professional development that focused on having students recite or drill orally demonstrated an increase in the use of such methods.	**Validation Procedure:** Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed.
1999:	**40%**	**No SAHE data**	**50%**		
2000:			Continuous increase		
2001:			Continuous increase		
Professional development focused on having students engage in paper-and-pencil exercises					**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The data on effects on classroom instruction are self-reported by participants.
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	No data available				
1999:	**22%**	**No SAHE data**	**50%**		
2000:			Continuous increase		
2001:			Continuous increase		

OBJECTIVE 2: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS SUSTAINED, INTENSIVE, AND HIGH QUALITY AND HAS A LASTING IMPACT ON CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.

Indicator 2.1 High quality: Increasing percentages of teachers will participate in Eisenhower-assisted professional development activities that reflect best practices.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Status: No 1999 data. The 1998 target was met on only three dimensions of best practice by districts and on four dimensions of best practice by SAHE grantees. **Explanation:** Districts met the 1998 targets in academic content, follow-up with other activities, and planning classroom implementation. SAHE grantees met the 1998 targets in academic content, follow-up with activities; planning classroom implementation; and presenting, leading, and writing. The program is relatively strong in placing a major emphasis on academic content and in several other dimensions. However, there is some room for improvement on dimensions where target was met. Review of baseline data led ED to lower the performance targets so that they would be more realistic for the years 2000 and 2001. The original indicator had a target of 75 percent for year 2000.	**Source:** Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999. (Data were collected in 1998.) *Frequency:* Biannually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data were verified through the Department of Education attestation process.

Major emphasis on academic content

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	
1998:	51%	68%	50%
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous improvement**
2000:			56% for districts; 72% for SAHE grantees
2001:			Continuous improvement

Involves all teachers in grade, department, or school

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	
1998:	19%	11%	50%
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous improvement**
2000:			56% for districts and SAHE grantees
2001:			Continuous improvement

Is followed up with other activities

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	
1998:	53%	70%	50%
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous improvement**
2000:			56% for districts and 75% SAHE grantees
2001:			Continuous improvement

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Involves					
a) Planning classroom implementation					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	66%	83%	50%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous improvement**		
2000:			56% for districts; 86% for SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous improvement		
b) Presenting, leading, and writing					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	40%	67%	50%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous improvement**		
2000:			56% for districts; 70% for SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous improvement		
c) Observing and being observed					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	19%	35%	50%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous improvement**		
2000:			56% for districts and SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous improvement		
d) Reviewing student work					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			
1998:	30%	38%	50%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous improvement**		
2000:			56% for districts and SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous improvement		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indicator 2.2 Sustained professional development: Increasing percentages of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities will participate in activities that span 6 months or longer.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of teachers in activities that span 6 months or longer				**Status:** No 1999 data, but 1998 data show that 1998 target was met by SAHE grantees but not by districts. Progress toward 1999 target is not likely for the districts.	**Source:** Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999 (Data were collected in 1998).
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
	Districts	SAHE Grantees			*Next Update:* 2000.
1998:	20%	46%	**35%**		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuous improvement**	**Explanation:** SAHE grantees spend over twice as many Eisenhower dollars per participant per activity as the districts do; this may partly explain why the SAHE grantees offer activities that are longer in duration than do districts.	**Validation Procedure:** Data verified through the Department of Education attestation process.
2000:			39% for districts; 50% for SAHE grantees		
2001:			Continuous improvement		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

OBJECTIVE 3: HIGH-QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS PROVIDED TO TEACHERS WHO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS.

Indicator 3.1 High-poverty schools: The proportion of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities who teach in high-poverty schools will exceed the proportion of the national teacher pool who teach in high-poverty schools.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Eisenhower participants who teach in high-poverty schools*				**Status:** No 1999 data, but 1998 data indicate that progress toward 1999 target is likely for district part of program and is unlikely for SAHE part of program.	**Source:** Designing Effective Professional Development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program (National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report), 1999.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	For both districts and SAHE grantees**		*Next Update:* 2000.
1998:	23%	13%	23%		
1999:	**No data available**		**25%**	**Explanation:** Twenty-one percent of teachers in the nation teach in high-poverty schools; 23 percent of participants in Eisenhower district-level activities teach in high-poverty schools; and 13 percent of participants in Eisenhower activities sponsored by grantees of the SAHE teach in high-poverty schools. Both districts and SAHE grantees rely mostly on volunteers for participants, and neither does much targeting of whole schools of teachers. This may partly explain why the proportion of teachers from high-poverty schools is very low for the SAHE grantees.	**Validation Procedure:** Verified through the Department of Education attestation process.
2000:			27%		
2001:			29%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

*High-poverty schools are those where 50 percent or more of the students are eligible for free lunches.
**In FY 1995-96, 21 percent of teachers in the Nation taught in high-poverty schools. Targets are based on this baseline.

OBJECTIVE 4: MEASUREMENT OF INTEGRATED PLANNING AND COLLABORATION.

Indicator 4.1 Increasing percentages of states will adopt performance indicators for professional development, demonstrate a technical understanding of such indicators, and have data (or plans to collect data) for their indicators.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** The 1999 target was slightly exceeded.	**Source:** An Analysis of Eisenhower Triennial Reports (Draft), AEL, Inc., 1999.
1998:	No data available	50%	**Explanation:** Although almost every state claims to have indicators, only 72 percent have demonstrated that they have actually adopted indicators, have a technical understanding of indicators, and have either data or plans to collect data for their indicators.	*Frequency:* Triennially. *Next Update:* 2002.
1999:	**72%**	**70%**		**Validation Procedure:** Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.
2000:		90%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The data summarized in the AEL report were submitted to ED by states. Not all states with indicators and data may actually be using them to manage the program.
2001:		100%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To review performance-indicator information that states provide on Triennial Performance Reports and develop and provide technical assistance to states on indicators in accordance with that review. Promote ability of states to provide technical assistance to local education agencies in developing indicators tied to standards of such organizations as the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), and the National Research Council. (Example: Title II annual coordinators meeting. The program will work with PES to address funding for this activity.)
- To encourage states to adopt and report on strategies that promote professional development activities extending over the entire school year. (Example: The program's new professional development evaluation publication, Impact, and an upcoming (Feb. 2000) Web site will help address this issue.)
- To work with Eisenhower state agencies for higher education (SAHE) coordinators to encourage professional development collaboration with state education agencies (SEA) and with local education agencies. (Example: The program will feature a session at the Eisenhower summer conference that addresses this important need, and will seek to give space in Impact and on the Web site to practices worthy of emulation.)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To promote effective professional development as described in the Department's Mission and Principles of High Quality Professional Development. The program will use four means to accomplish this: specific topics for seminars at the summer Eisenhower conference for State Education Agency (SEA) and State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) coordinators; formal discussion at the Improving America's Schools Conferences late in 2000; and use of Impact and the upcoming evaluation Web site. Besides these, staff covering Title II on their integrated reviews will ensure the topic is on the onsite agenda.
- To help states use their indicator systems to promote needs-based plans that take into consideration professional development for teachers working with disadvantaged populations. The program will use integrated review team visits, an ideal medium for high-impact discussion, to bring home this important part of the statute. We will highlight the usefulness and availability of the program's Equity Assistance Centers as resources for states that seek help.
- The program stresses the need for Title II coordinators to work with Title I counterparts to greatly increase attention to the professional development needs of teachers from high-poverty schools and underrepresented populations. Program staff will engage in dialogue with their Title I counterparts to fashion collaborative activities, and integrated review staffs will extend this collaborative effort.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- The National Science Foundation, through its State Strategic Initiative, collaborates with Title II coordinators in many states to bring coherence to professional development activities in local education agencies. Funds are pooled to strengthen local efforts to provide sustained, high-quality, intensive, and aligned teacher training. Inadequate staffing impedes efforts to do more active programming. The program is preparing in the second quarter of FY 2000 to add two staff members who will have the responsibility to forge collaborations between such agencies as NASA, Department of Energy, Department of the Interior, Corporation for National Service, and others.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- In technical assistance visits to states and local school districts, program staff regularly encounter concerns about recruitment and retention of able teachers, including those from underrepresented groups. This reflects the general teacher-preparedness situation nationwide.
- Staff members see the need for greater efforts to communicate promising practices in professional development. Many universities are working to narrow the gap that exists between the findings of research and applications to the needs of schools. In addition, the program is close to inauguration of a professional development and evaluation Web site (due second quarter, FY 2000).
- The program notes a consistent inability to directly attribute gains in student achievement to professional development without controlling for other factors that affect achievement.
- Although districts and SAHE grantees report that they make an effort to reach teachers of special populations, teachers from high-poverty schools do not participate at very high rates. It is a challenge to help districts and SAHE grantees improve their targeting of such teachers.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 3.1 was modified to make the target more realistic. The year 2000 target was lowered from over 75 percent to 56 percent.
- Indicator 3.2 was modified in scope and target; see explanation below on "change in last year's Indicator 3.2." The target was also changed because the 1999 target was not likely to be met. The target now looks at professional development that extends beyond 6 months, with a year 2000 target of 39 percent.
- Target 5.2 was changed as described below under "small change to last year's indicator 6.1."

Dropped

- Indicators 4.2 and 5.1 were dropped as discussed below.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- The targets that were mentioned in the text of the indicators have been moved to the target column so the actual indicators read "increasing percentages:" Indicator 1.1 (now 1.1 and 1.2); Indicators 3.1 and 3.2 (now 2.1 and 2.2); Indicator 6.2 (now 4.2).
- Indicator 3.1: The indicator had said "district-level Eisenhower-assisted activities," but ED decided that this was an important indicator for both districts and SAHE grantees, so the "district-level" modifier was deleted.
- Indicator 3.2 (now Indicator 2.2): The old indicator read, "By 1998, 35 percent of teachers participating in district-level Eisenhower-assisted activities will participate in activities that are a component of professional development that extends over the school year." In a national survey, it is difficult to measure the extent to which Eisenhower activities are truly "components" of other activities and also to collect extensive information on the time span of those other activities. In addition, it is important to encourage grantees to increase the time span of Eisenhower activities. In addition, although most states claim to have indicators, a better measure is whether states demonstrate technical understanding of indicators and whether states have concrete plans to collect data for their indicators. Therefore, ED changed the indicator accordingly.
- Indicator 6.1 (now Indicator 4.1): The old indicator said that at least 50 percent of states will have performance indicators for "integrated professional development across programs in order to support systemic reform." Through ED's contact with states, ED learned that some Eisenhower state coordinators could not force coordinators of other programs to jointly develop professional development performance indicators or to use a common set of indicators across programs. States also seemed to be having a difficult time with the technical aspects of developing and using indicators. In addition, although most states claim to have indicators, a better measure is whether states demonstrate technical understanding of indicators and whether states have concrete plans to collect data for their indicators. Therefore, ED changed the indicator accordingly.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1: "By 1998, over 50 percent of teachers participating in district-level or higher education Eisenhower-assisted professional development will participate in activities that are aligned with high standards. By 2000, over 75 percent will." This indicator was deleted for several reasons: First, the existing data indicated that the program was doing very well on this indicator, and so program staff felt that it was less important to track improvements over time. (eighty percent of teachers who participated in district-administered Eisenhower activities indicated that the activities were aligned with state or district standards.) Second, it would be more valuable to do an independent assessment of the alignment, but this would be too costly to do on a national scale.
- Indicator 4.2: "Teachers in high-poverty schools will participate in intensive, sustained, high-quality professional development at rates comparable with, or higher than, the rates for teachers in other schools." Data from 1994 and 1999 showed that this indicator was met or exceeded. In addition, because the indicator does not refer specifically to Eisenhower, but rather to all professional development, ED decided to delete it from the Eisenhower plan. Measures that are not program specific are more appropriate in Volume 1 of the Strategic Plan.
- Indicator 5.1: "The number of Eisenhower state coordinators who report that the Department's guidance and assistance are timely and helpful will increase." ED decided that it was important to track this for internal management purposes, but not necessary for submitting the plan to Congress.

New – None.

TEACHING TO HIGH STANDARDS STATE GRANTS

Goal: To support high-quality professional development and comprehensive state and local education reform tied to high standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Teaching to High Standards State Grants supports Objective 1.1 (states develop challenging standards) and Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America).

FY 2001—$690,000,000 (Requested budget for proposed new program)

OBJECTIVE 1: TO SUPPORT COMPREHENSIVE STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION REFORM TIED TO HIGH STANDARDS.

Indicator 1.1 Standards and assessments for additional core subjects: Increasing numbers of states will have challenging content and performance standards and aligned assessments in place for social studies and science, in addition to those in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Not applicable	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Not applicable		
FY 2002:		Baseline set		**Validation Procedure:** Unknown.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 1.2 Schools' implementation of systemic reform: Increasing numbers of schools will have curriculum, instruction, and professional development aligned with state or local standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
FY 2000:		Not applicable	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Not applicable		
FY 2002:		Baseline set		**Validation Procedure:** Unknown.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

OBJECTIVE 2: TO PROMOTE EXCELLENT TEACHING THAT WILL ENABLE ALL STUDENTS TO REACH CHALLENGING STATE AND LOCAL STANDARDS.

Indicator 2.1 Improved classroom instruction: Increasing percentages of teachers who participate in Title II-supported professional development activities will report that those activities enabled them to prepare their students to achieve to challenging state or local content and performance standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 2.2 Increasing percentages of teachers who participate in Title II-supported professional development will participate in activities that embody the characteristics of high-quality professional development. (High-quality professional development (1) is sustained over an extended period of time; (2) is aligned with state and district standards and assessments; (3) strongly emphasizes the deepening of teachers' knowledge of academic content and understanding of ways that students learn that content; (4) encourages teachers from the same grade levels, departments, and schools to work in teams; (5) offers opportunities to observe and practice the skills and techniques being introduced; and (6) is regularly evaluated for its effects on teachers' instructional practices and contributions to student achievement.)

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 2.3 Gains in student achievement: Within a 5-year period, in a sample of selected sites that receive Title II funds through a formula grant as well as competitive grant, the Title II professional development will contribute to gains in student achievement.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

OBJECTIVE 3: TO PROMOTE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED NEW TEACHERS.

Indicator 3.1 High-quality induction programs: Increasing percentages of districts will use Title II funds to conduct high-quality induction programs as defined below. High-quality induction programs are those that (1) provide each new teacher with a highly competent, experienced mentor teacher of the same grade level and/or academic subject who works with the novice teacher on a weekly basis over the course of at least one school year; (2) provide all new teachers with a network of other new and experienced teachers with whom they can discuss their classroom experiences and provide one another with ongoing support; (3) provide each new teacher with regular opportunities to meet with the principal and other school leaders who can provide instructional guidance and support; and (4) provide new teachers with ongoing opportunities to deepen their content knowledge and pedagogical skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 3.2 Increased retention rates: The 3-year retention rate of new teachers will increase in districts that partner with the higher education institutions and nonprofit organizations that receive Title II grants from the State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

OBJECTIVE 4: TO ENSURE THAT TEACHERS FROM HIGH-POVERTY AND LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS PARTICIPATE IN HIGH-QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

Indicator 4.1 Participation by teachers from high-poverty, low-performing schools: The proportion of teachers participating in Title II-assisted activities who teach in high-poverty, low-performing schools will exceed the proportion of the national teacher pool who teach in such schools.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indicator 4.2 Retention rate of new teachers: The percentage of newly minted teachers who remain employed as teachers in the district for at least 3 years will increase in those districts that receive or participate (through a partnership) in one of the competitive Title II grants.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Biannually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To be established.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

New—Not applicable.

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP INITIATIVE

Goal: To improve the quality of school-building leadership, particularly in high-poverty, low-performing schools.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This program supports Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by creating innovative approaches to the recruitment, preparation, and support of principals so that they may serve as effective instructional leaders.

FY 2001—$40,000,000 (Requested budget for proposed new program)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE PRINCIPALS WITH THE SKILLS NECESSARY TO CREATE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS CONDUCIVE TO PREPARING ALL STUDENTS TO ACHIEVE TO CHALLENGING STANDARDS.

Indicator 1.1 Increasing percentages of teachers whose principals participate in program activities will report that their principal creates a school in which organization, staffing arrangements, and the use of time all support continuous improvement of instructional practices and student achievement.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 1.2 The percentage of participants in center activities who participate in activities that are of high quality will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	Not applicable	Not applicable		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- The department will disseminate information to grantees on best practices in professional development for school leaders.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The grantees will be encouraged to coordinate School Leadership professional development with professional development being offered through *Teaching High Standards*.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

NATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING AND SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

EISENHOWER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of all students through the provision of high-quality instructional materials and information about effective programs, and through the expansion of a cadre of highly accomplished teachers.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program: Federal Activities supports Objective 1.4 a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (every eighth grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In addition, the program supports Objective 2.3 by promoting access to high-quality math and science materials through the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse.

FY 2000—$23,300,000

FY 2001—$25,000,000 (Requested budget for National Activities for the Improvement of Teaching and School Leadership, which is proposed to replace Eisenhower Federal Activities)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND INFORMATION ABOUT EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Indicator 1.1 Utility: At least 80 percent of customers who use clearinghouse products will report that the products meet their needs in terms of being easy to access, up to date, and of value to their work.

Targets and Performance Data

Percent of customers who report that products are:

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Easy to Access	Up to Date	Value to Work	Easy to Access	Up to Date	Value to Work
1998:	64%	73%	74%			
1999:	**89%**	**96%**	**91%**	**No target set**		
2000:				72%	72%	72%
2001:				76%	76%	76%
2002:				80%	80%	80%

Assessment of Progress

Status: 2000 target exceeded.

Explanation: The clearinghouse has placed increasing emphasis on customer satisfaction. The respondents in the data in the performance table represent those sample members who remembered the clearinghouse materials well enough to respond.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Preliminary Report on FY 1999 Performance from the Clearinghouse and Cross-Consortia Evaluation Team, 1999.
Frequency: Biennially.
Next Update: 2001.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by the Clearinghouse and the Eisenhower Cross-Consortia Evaluation Team. The Clearinghouse and the Cross-Consortia Evaluation Team use an internal review procedure to ensure common terminology and data collection and analysis procedures.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The survey had an overall response rate of 30 percent (147 out of 491 sample members). An independent, national evaluation will provide data in 2000.

OBJECTIVE 2: CONTRIBUTE TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF ALL STUDENTS BY EXPANDING THE CADRE OF HIGHLY ACCOMPLISHED TEACHERS.

Indicator 2.1 Standards and assessments developed: The number of standards and assessments developed, approved, and offered by the board will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** The 1999 target has been met.	**Source:** Board reports, 1999.
1998:	7			*Frequency:* Annually.
1999:	**12**	**12**	**Explanation:** The board has been able to continue the development of standards and assessments because of continued financial support from the Federal government and other sources.	*Next Update:* 2000.
2000:		16		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the board. Data corroborated by other information from the board.
2001:		19		
2002:		25		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

Indicator 2.2 Teachers certified: The number of teachers who will be awarded Board certification will increase annually and will reach a cumulative total of 22,000 by 2002.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Cumulative number of teachers certified			**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Source:** Board reports, 1999.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1997:	924		**Explanation:** Thirty-eight states and 146 school districts offer some kind of incentive for teachers to apply for national board certification; these incentives have helped to increase the number of applicants for national board certification. (These incentives include supports, such as fee support, salary supplements, and license portability.) In addition, the national board certification is generally viewed as providing a high-quality product.	*Next Update:* 2000.
1998:	1,835			
1999:	**4,803**	**3,600**		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the board. Data corroborated by other information available on nationally board certified teachers.
2000:		7,900		
2001:		15,000		
2002:		22,000		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Eisenhower National Clearinghouse:
  - To improve the accessibility and quality of clearinghouse products, the program will work with the Department's leadership teams, the National Science Foundation, other agencies, and the Eisenhower Regional Consortia to develop comprehensive strategies for disseminating products to target audiences, tracking use of products, and obtaining customer feedback to ensure that the products are used effectively to improve mathematics and science education.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards:
  - To identify resources, coordinate services, collaborate, sustain efforts to improve professional development, and provide incentives and encourage teachers to apply for board certification, the program will facilitate collaboration among grantees, state and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, professional organizations, and local partners.
  - To assist the Department in achieving its goals, the program will work with the board to use board-certified teachers as speakers, peer reviewers, and other resources.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Eisenhower National Clearinghouse:
  - To further standardization of procedures and enhancement of coordination among resource providers, the program will facilitate clearinghouse collaboration with other Federal clearinghouses.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards:
  - To ensure that appropriate resources are targeted to the highest-need schools, the board and the Department will track the number of nationally board-certified teachers who work in high-poverty schools and develop strategies to increase their numbers. As of early February 2000, data on the poverty level of the schools of Nationally Board Certified teachers were available for only 2,287 of the 4,803 teachers. Data on those 2,287 teachers show that 16.7 percent work in high-poverty schools—e.g., schools with 50 percent or more of their students eligible for free lunch. It is important to note that the 2,287 teachers are not a representative sample of all nationally board certified teachers.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The clearinghouse annually contact other Federal agencies to collect math and science education materials and to update the Directory of Federal Resources that it produces.
- To improve the compatibility of databases and increase electronic access to educational materials, the clearinghouse helped to found the Gateway to Educational Materials, a consortium of Federal agencies active in math and science education. The clearinghouse director serves as co-chair of the consortium governing board.
- The clearinghouse advises the National Air and Space Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Endowment for the Humanities on technology and database issues for their K–12 curriculum projects and activities.
- The clearinghouse participates in the interagency Federal Dissemination Experts Network to assist in integrating Federal educational resources into a national dissemination system.
- The clearinghouse also collaborates extensively with the Eisenhower Regional Consortia on product development and dissemination.
- The Board works directly with Department grantees, such as the National Alliance of Black School Educators, and with Department-funded regional laboratories, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and engages in Department-funded research.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- A 1997 national evaluation recommended that the clearinghouse focus on "ease of use" when designing products and that it more clearly link all clearinghouse products and services, print or electronic, to improve customer access. The FY 1999 customer rating of 89 percent for "easy to access" is evidence of clearinghouse improvement in this area.
- The 1997 national evaluation also recommended that the clearinghouse pursue mechanisms that distribute its products and services at the level of teachers. Clearinghouse products and services such as workshops are targeted at teachers. A national evaluation in 2000 will assess improvements in reaching teachers.
- The clearinghouse has a mandate to disseminate information broadly. It is difficult for a single entity with limited resources to meet all of the constantly changing needs of such a wide audience.
- For the board, the certification fee is seen as a barrier by some teachers. This is especially the case in the states and districts where no incentives (fee supports, salary supplements) are offered. Currently 38 states and 146 districts offer some kind of incentive, but there is a challenge to get more state legislatures and districts to offer incentives.
- Many teachers throughout the country are still not aware of the board and the certification process. When the development of all 25 standards and assessments is complete, outreach efforts will become the board's number one priority.
- In many states and localities, there is very little professional support for teachers who want to undertake the board assessment process.
- Full utilization of the board will occur only when all states and localities enact meaningful incentives for teachers to apply for and maintain national board certification. Because not all states and districts offer incentives and supports, some teachers face obstacles in applying for certification.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1, on the utility of clearinghouse products, was adjusted to match the measures of quality used on the clearinghouse/cross-consortia customer survey.

Dropped

- Object 1 and Indicator 1.1, on demonstration activities, were dropped because of continued lack of funding for projects in this category.

New—None.

EISENHOWER REGIONAL MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION CONSORTIA

Goal: To improve mathematics and science education through technical assistance and dissemination.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Consortia support Objective 1.1 (States develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects), Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America), and Objective 2.3 (every eighth grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by providing standards-based professional development, technical assistance, and high-quality products in math and science.

FY 2000—$15,000,000

FY 2001—$15,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, INCLUDING PLANNING ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, FACILITATION OF COLLABORATION AND NETWORKING, AND OTHER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Indicator 1.1 Technical Assistance: At least 80 percent of participants in Consortia technical assistance activities will report that information or assistance from the Consortia added value to their work.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Training improved instructional practice			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Data reported are baseline data. Data are not available on all of the goals because this indicator was just recently revised to respond to comments in appropriations mark-up. Data on the factors other than training/professional development and collaboration will be available in 2001.	**Source:** Cross-Consortia report, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Internal review procedures of Cross-Consortia evaluation committee. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Customer surveys were conducted by the Consortia. The survey response rate was 36 percent (2,070 out of 5,830 customers surveyed). Consortia data will be corroborated by a national evaluation in 2000. Future Consortia surveys will include all of the factors in the new indicator.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	91%			
1999:	**No data available**	75%		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		
Training improved student engagement and performance				
1998:	89%			
1999:	**No data available**	75%		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		
Collaboration strengthened relationships and access to resources				
1998:	88%			
1999:	**No data available**	75%		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		
Collaboration leveraged resources and efforts for greater impact				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	80%			
1999:	**No data available**	75%		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		

OBJECTIVE 2: DISSEMINATE INFORMATION ABOUT PROMISING AND EXEMPLARY PRACTICES IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION.

Indicator 2.1 Dissemination: The total number of Consortia contacts with customers, by print or by electronic media ("hits" on Web sites plus other electronic communications), will increase by 10 percent annually, and a majority of the recipients will report that the information contributed to improving their work.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Print				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Print target exceeded. Unable to judge electronic media target or usefulness target.	**Source:** Cross-Consortia Report, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1997	306,557			
1998:	340,185			
1999:	**No data available**	**337,212**	**Explanation:** Print contacts increased 11 percent, from 306,557 in FY 1997 to 340,185 in FY 1998. Electronic media data are incomplete because new equipment at two Consortia complicated their data collection, and they were unable to report in this category. With only 8 of 10 Consortia reporting, contacts by electronic media appear to trend away from the target, with only an 8 percent increase, from 1,354,167 in FY 1997 to 1,465,259 in FY 1998. Usefulness data are baseline data.	**Validation Procedure:** Internal review procedures of Cross-Consortia evaluation committee.
2000:		306,167		
2001:		275,551		
2002:		247,996		
Electronic Media				
1997	1,354,167			**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None for quantitative data. Customer surveys were conducted by the Consortia. The survey response rate was 36 percent (2,070 out of 5,830 customers surveyed). Consortia data will be corroborated by a national evaluation in 2000.
1998:	1,465,259			
1999:	**No data available**	**1,489,583**		
2000:		1,638,541		
2001:		1,802,395		
2002:		1,982,634		
Usefulness				
1998:	70%			
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		51%		
2001:		51%		
2002:		51%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Work with the Department's initiatives leadership teams and Executive Management Council and with the National Science Foundation to develop and implement integrated plans for work in mathematics and science education.
- With the advice and guidance of their regional boards, the Consortia will set priorities for technical assistance activities in their regions and develop and implement strategic plans to identify key stakeholders and solicit their collaboration.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To further focus the mission of the Consortia, the program will develop an absolute priority consistent with the Department's strategic priorities for the FY 2000 recompetition of these grants.
- To maintain consistency of quality among the projects, the program will facilitate the integration of any new Consortia grantees into the national network of the Eisenhower Regional Consortia and National Clearinghouse.
- To support the increased use of technology and reduce dissemination costs, the program will encourage the Consortia to reduce print dissemination and increase electronic dissemination of their products and information.
- To support the Department's math initiative, the program will provide advice and technical assistance on the development and implementation of the new cross-Consortia professional development project for middle school mathematics.
- To encourage continuous improvement and more strategic planning, the program will work with the Department's Planning and Evaluation Service to supplement the national evaluation of the Consortia and provide feedback directly to the Consortia for formative evaluation.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To increase awareness of the results of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and its implications for math and science education in the United States, the program has collaborated with the Department's National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and the National Science Foundation to utilize the capacity of the Consortia to disseminate information and to train educators about TIMSS.
- To encourage the implementation of more high-quality mathematics and science curricula, the program has collaborated with the National Science Foundation and the Department's Expert Panels to use the Consortia to disseminate information about NSF-developed curricula and the Department's designated exemplary and promising mathematics programs.
- To increase the availability of high-quality professional development materials, the Consortia collaborate extensively with the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse on product development and dissemination.
- To ensure that their activities are coordinated with other Federal activities, the Consortia include representatives of mathematics and science education projects sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the National Air and Space Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency on their advisory boards and state teams.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The Department's Planning and Evaluation Service is conducting a series of national evaluations of the Consortia. The 1998 report concluded that it is incumbent on both the Department and the Consortia to continue seeking clarity about the program's mission and how well the mission is carried out, and to set appropriate expectations for the quality, scope, and impact of the Consortia's portfolios of activities and services. The 1999 report found that the Consortia continue to face the challenge of how to invest their limited resources and that they could improve their quality control processes and internal evaluation efforts. Both reports found that the Consortia continue to mature as organizations and as a Federal program. The 1999 report also found that the Consortia have achieved an impressive level of consistency between research-based definitions of high-quality professional development and technical assistance and their activities, and that the Consortia are making contributions to the improvement of mathematics and science education in their regions. The 1999 report found further that the Consortia are engaged in activities that states are less able to do and that they bring expertise to their regions that states cannot provide.
- Because the Consortia do not work directly in classrooms, it is difficult for them to demonstrate causal impact on student engagement or performance. Technical assistance is designed to impact capacity, policy, and instructional practices. Dissemination is designed to increase awareness of and access to exemplary resources.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.1 and 2.1 and Objective 3 and its indicator were dropped in FY 2000 because the department wanted more concise performance plans.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

See explanation under New below.

Dropped—None.

New

- Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 were changed to respond to House Mark-Up language and to include more information from data collection conducted by the Consortia and by the national evaluation. This year's Indicator 1.1 combines last year's Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 into one technical assistance indicator because of overlap between last year's indicators.

339

TEACHER QUALITY INITIATIVES

Goal: To help states and school districts raise the performance of educators in our Nation's schools.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Teacher Quality Initiatives programs support Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America). The programs support Objective 1.4 by encouraging young adults to become teachers and supporting them in their undergraduate teacher training and first years of teaching, by helping school districts reform their teacher evaluation practices, and by rewarding school districts for hiring fully certified teachers and reducing out-of-field teaching.

FY 2001—$175,000,000 (Requested budget for proposed new program)

OBJECTIVE 1: THE HOMETOWN TEACHERS INITIATIVE WILL RECRUIT AND TRAIN HIGHLY MOTIVATED AND TALENTED STUDENTS TO BECOME TEACHERS IN HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Indicator 1.1 District administrators will report that program participants they hire as teachers are better prepared, on average, than other newly certified teachers hired by the school district.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2002.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

OBJECTIVE 2: THE HIGHER STANDARDS, HIGHER PAY INITIATIVE WILL PROVIDE GRANTS TO HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO HELP THEM ATTRACT AND RETAIN HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS THROUGH BETTER PAY.

Indicator 2.1 The percentage of highly qualified teachers and principals who continue to work in the grantee district will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2002.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	
FY 2001:		Target to be set		Annual performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2002.
				Validation Procedure: No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- ED is partnering with the Department of Labor and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to change current policies that are barriers to the hiring of teachers from overseas in shortage areas within the United States.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The strong economy provides many nonteaching career options to talented young people.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—Not applicable.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRANSITION TO TEACHING: TROOPS TO TEACHERS

Goal: To recruit, prepare, place, and support talented career-changing professionals as teachers, particularly in high-poverty school districts and in high-need subject areas.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This program supports Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by providing funds to grantees to improve the recruitment, retention, and quality of teachers in high-poverty districts and high-need subject areas.

FY 2000–$25,000,000 (Requested budget for proposed new program)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENCOURAGE GRANTEES TO RECRUIT PROFESSIONALS WHO HAVE A SOLID BACKGROUND IN THE SUBJECT MATTER THAT THEY WISH TO TEACH.

Indicator 1.1 At least 80 percent of participants who plan to teach at the secondary school level will have at least a bachelor's degree in the field they are going to teach or in a related academic field.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 1.2 At least 80 percent of participants will report that they feel very well prepared to teach because of the training they received in content-specific instructional strategies.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

OBJECTIVE 2: ENSURE THAT GRANTEES ARE ACTIVELY HELPING PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS FIND TEACHING POSITIONS IN HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOLS.

Indicator 2.1 At least 70 percent of participants will complete teacher training and obtain teaching positions in high-poverty schools.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 2.2 Of those participants who obtain employment in a high poverty school, at least 85 percent will teach for at least three years in the high-poverty school district in which they were originally employed.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program evaluation.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2002.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- This program supports and builds upon the Defense Department's Troops to Teachers program.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

New—Not applicable.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Goal: To promote school readiness and better reading outcomes for young children aged birth through kindergarten, living in high-poverty areas, through high-quality professional development.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program supports Objectives 2.1 (all children ready to learn) and 2.2 (every child reads by third grade).

FY 2001—$30,000,000 (Requested budget for proposed new program)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS AND CAREGIVERS WORKING IN HIGH-POVERTY COMMUNITIES TO ENABLE THEM TO FURTHER CHILDREN'S LANGUAGE AND LITERACY SKILLS.

Indicator 1.1 Increasing percentages of classrooms staffed by early childhood educators who participated in program-assisted professional development will show an improvement in the literacy environment.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Not applicable	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Baseline to be set		
				Validation Procedure: No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 1.2 Increasing percentages of early childhood educators will report knowledge and understanding of effective, research-based approaches to language and literacy development and early childhood pedagogy.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Grantee performance reports.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Not applicable	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Baseline to be set		
				Validation Procedure: No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To be established.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—Not applicable.

READING EXCELLENCE PROGRAM

READING EXCELLENCE PROGRAM

Goal: To improve reading for children in high-poverty schools and schools that need improvement by supporting research-based reading instruction and tutoring.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Reading Excellence Act (REA) Program directly supports Objective 2.2 (every child reading by the end of third grade) through REA's support of professional development, family involvement, and supportive tutoring services. The program also supports Objective 2.4 (special populations) because it focuses its resources on schools with high poverty rates or numbers and on schools identified as needing improvement. Models resulting from this program will be helpful to similar districts elsewhere. The program supports Objective 2.1 (all children entering school ready to learn) through its family literacy activities. Finally, this program will identify effective models for teacher training in reading that can be used to support Objective 1.4 (teacher preparation).

FY 2000—$260,000,000

FY 2001—$286,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS AND CLASSROOMS.

Indicator 1.1 Participating students' achievement: By 2002, participating students will increase their reading scores significantly compared with comparable nonparticipants.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge—new program.	**Source:** School Impact and Implementation Study.
1999:	**New Program**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** The Impact and Implementation Study will assess teacher development of expertise in reading instruction. Baseline data will be collected on students in participating schools starting in school year 2000-01.	*Next update:* 2001.
2001:		Baseline year		**Validation Procedures:** Will be verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data
2002:		Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Not known.

OBJECTIVE 2: BUILD THE CAPACITY OF STATES AND LOCAL DISTRICTS TO DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES FOR READING THAT RESULT IN EFFECTIVE CHANGES IN CLASSROOMS.

Indicator 2.1 Teacher knowledge: An increasing number of teachers participating in program-sponsored training will develop expertise in research-based reading instruction methods.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge—new program.	**Source:** School Impact and Implementation Study.
1999:	**New Program**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** The Impact and Implementation Study will examine the effects of REA on district and school activities, including REA's impact on language minority students, starting in school year 2000-01.	*Next update:* 2001.
2001:		Baseline year		**Validation Procedures:** Will be verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Not known.

Indicator 2.2 Instructional change: An increasing number of teachers participating in program-sponsored training will significantly align their instruction with research-based, effective practice.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge—new program.	**Source:** School Impact and Implementation Study.
1999:	**New Program**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** The Impact and Implementation Study will examine the effects of REA on district and school activities, including REA's impact on language minority students, starting in school year 2000-01.	*Next update:* 2001.
2001:		Baseline year		**Validation Procedures:** Will be verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Not known.

Indicator 2.3 Tutors: An increasing number of well-trained tutors will use research-based practices to help children learn to read.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge—new program.	**Source:** School Impact and Implementation Study.
1999:	**New Program**	**No target set**		*Frequency*: Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** The Impact and Implementation Study will assess the use of tutors in local reading improvement subgrants as well as in Tutorial Assistance subgrants. Baseline data will be collected on tutor practice in participating schools starting in school year 2000-01.	*Next update*: 2001.
2001:		Baseline year		Program reports from Corporation for National Service. *Frequency*: Annually. *Next update*: 2001.
				Federal Work-Study program data on tutoring, 2000. *Frequency*: Annually. *Next update*: 2001.
				Validation Procedures: Will be verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Possible lack of consistent definitions between programs. Will coordinate with other offices when developing actual measures.

Indicator 2.4 Family reading: An increasing number of parents participating in program-sponsored activities will provide enriched home-reading opportunities to their children.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge—new program.	**Source:** School Impact and Implementation Study.
1999:	**New Program**	**No target set**		*Frequency*: Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** The Impact and Implementation Study will examine in-home reading. Baseline data will be collected school year 2000-01.	*Next Update*: 2001.
2001:		Baseline year		**Validation Procedures:** Will be verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Not known.

Indicator 2.5 State system changes: By summer 2001, at least 16 states will have revised their state in-service training and guidelines for reading certification to reflect scientifically based reading research.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data.	**Source:** State and District Implementation Evaluation.
1999:	**New Program**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000		12 states	**Explanation:** The State and District Implementation Study will collect information on states' implementation of REA, including changes to state teacher certification.	*Next update:* 2001.
2001		Another 4 states		**Validation Procedures:** Will be verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Not known.

OBJECTIVE 3: IDENTIFY AND VALIDATE RESEARCH-BASED MODELS OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE FOR READING INSTRUCTION, READING TUTORING, AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

Indicator 3.1 Model identification: By 2002, at least five research-based reading programs, strategies, or teacher training programs will be validated as effective and suitable as models for other districts and states.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge—new program.	**Source:** Causal studies, including:
1999:	**New Program**	**No target set**		Effects of REA Framework on Children's Reading Growth.
2000		No target set	**Explanation:** Work in the area of model identification will consist of longitudinal studies in selected sites.	*Frequency:* Annually.
2001		3 model programs or strategies		*Next Update:* 2001.
2002		2 additional model programs or strategies		Promising Instructional Practice for English language learners.
				Frequency: Annually.
				Next Update: 2001.
				Effective Tutoring Practices.
				Frequency: Annually.
				Next Update: 2001.
				Validation Procedures: Will be verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Use the evaluation and dissemination funding to develop additional information on effective reading instruction and professional development (using scientifically based evaluation research methods) in collaboration with the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and other offices in the Department of Education, including the Planning and Evaluation Service, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and the Office of Special Education Programs.
- Develop guidance for states and local programs regarding appropriate evaluation and student assessment methods and effective approaches for professional development in reading.
- Develop content guidance on effective practices in reading, tutoring, family literacy, and professional development—based on valid and reliable scientific research—using the best from exemplary Reading Excellence projects as well as from continually research findings.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Create a partnership with state grantees to implement an outstanding program that makes a significant impact on children's reading in participating schools and provides insight and models for other states, districts, and schools. Provide differentiated technical assistance and training for states and subgrantee districts and schools, stance would be as follows:
  - Foster partnerships between reading researchers and highly effective local schools to increase understanding of effective reading practices.
  - Link advanced projects with others that need to improve.
  - Support content training by experts for projects that are good but not "great."
  - Assemble teams of ED staff, state staff, and specialized contractors for projects that need help (often a management rather than a content problem).
  - Plan activities, hold workshops, symposiums, and training programs on content and program management issues, support research-project partnerships; maintain a high-quality Web site; and provide specialized technical assistance based on the needs of individual schools, districts, and states.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Coordinate with the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), the National Academy of Sciences, and the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) to identify expert panel reviewers, review national evaluation plans, and develop program strategies.
- Collaborate with the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) as it identifies and disseminates information on scientifically based research on reading and on effective programs, including those identified by state or Federal evaluations.
- Coordinate with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL), the Department of Health and Human Services' Head Start program, the Corporation for National Service, and other ED programs with related services (for example, Title I, Even Start, IDEA, Bilingual Education, Eisenhower Professional Development, the new Teacher Quality Enhancement program, Technology Challenge programs, the new Class-size Reduction program, Federal College Work Study, Research Institutes and Regional Labs, and Adult Education). Coordination is needed to make efficient use of available Federal resources and to ensure that as states and local communities are implementing the Reading Excellence Act, they receive appropriate cooperation and support from related programs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- To ensure that the Department and states work in partnership so that participating schools are implementing research-based instructional practices in their classrooms.
- To develop evaluation and performance measurement systems that support continuous improvement and contribute to the substantive knowledge base on reading instruction.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- The Goal changed to better reflect REA's program objectives.
- Objective 2, Indicator 2.2 was changed based on the evaluation plan. The date for expected progress changed from 2001 to 2002. (Note that Objective 2 is now Objective 1 because Objective 1 from last year was removed.)
- Objective 3, Indicator 3.5 was changed based on the evaluation plan. The date for expected progress changed from January 2001 to summer 2001. The number of states that will revise teacher certification changed from 15 to 16. (Note that Objective 3 is now Objective 2.)
- Objective 5, Indicator 5.1 was changed based on evaluation plan. The date for expected progress changed from 2001 to 2002. The word "strategies" was also added to this indicator.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

Dropped

- Objective 1, Indicator 1.1 was removed to streamline plan. It is a context indicator.
- Objective 3, Indicator 3.4 was removed to streamline plan. (Note that Objective 3 is now Objective 2.)
- Objective 4 was removed to streamline plan. Data will be collected on this objective and used internally.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

INDIAN EDUCATION

INDIAN EDUCATION

Goal: To help American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their unique educational and culturally related academic needs.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Indian Education Program supports Objectives 1.1 (states develop challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects) and 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards) of the Department's strategic plan. Program provides assistance for educational services that meet the unique needs of Indian students and families so that these children can learn to high standards.

FY 2000—$77,000,0000

FY 2001—$115,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE STUDENTS SERVED BY LEAS RECEIVING INDIAN EDUCATION FORMULA GRANTS WILL PROGRESS AT RATES SIMILAR TO THOSE FOR ALL STUDENTS IN ACHIEVEMENT TO STANDARDS, PROMOTION, AND GRADUATION.

Indicator 1.1 Student achievement: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by national assessments.

Targets and Performance Data		
Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1994:	48%	
1998:	47%	
1999:	**Next update in 2002**	**Data not available**
2000:		Continuing increase
2001:		Not available
2002:		60%
Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP		
1994:	63%	
1998:	61%	
1999:	**Next update in 2002**	**Not available**
2000:		Continuing increase
2001:		Not available
2002:		70%
Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP		
1992:	43%	
1996:	52%	
1999:	**Next update in 2002**	**Not available**
2000:		Continuing increase
2001:		Not available
2002:		64%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Reading—No statistically significant change. Math—Positive movement toward the targets.

Explanation: Increases in the percentage of students scoring above basic in math are occurring; however, similar increases are not occurring in reading because reading is more influenced by external factors other than school.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2002; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1997.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data validated by National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics statistical standards.

Limitations of Data: The small sample (for the sub-population of American Indian and Alaska Native students) means there is a high degree of standard error surrounding the estimates and limits data collection and possibilities for comparison to other populations. These estimates will vary greatly until a larger population is surveyed.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1992:	39%			
1996:	52%			
1999:	**Next update in 2000**	**Continuing increase**		
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		
2002:		62%		

Indicator 1.2 Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by states.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of students in schools who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The 1994 Elementary and Secondary School Act requires, by 2000-01, disaggregation of achievement data submitted by states to reflect American Indian and Alaska Native proficiency levels on state assessments.	**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Reports, Title I Section. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* Winter 2000. **Verification Procedure:** To be verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998-1999:	**Next update in 2000**	**Not applicable**		
1999-2000:		Baseline to be set		
2009-2010:		Not applicable		

Indicator 1.3 Student promotion and graduation: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will graduate at rates comparable to all students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native 20 to 24 years old who are high school graduates			**Status:** Data have been collected. Progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** Projects are targeting services to reduce dropouts and increase the graduation rates of American Indian and Alaska Native students. Increased promotion and graduation completion are expected.	**Source:** U.S. Census 1990, 2000, and 2010. *Frequency:* 10 years (U.S. Census 2000). *Next Update:* 2000. National Center for Educational Statistics Transcript Data, 2000-01. *Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* 2002-04. **Validation Procedure:** Census data validated by the Census Bureau review procedures and Census standards; OIE Annual Performance Report data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedures applied; National Center for Educational Statistics Transcript data. Validated by the National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics statistical standards. **Limitations of Data:** Participation in Census surveys varies by regions and location, resulting in undercount of population.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1989-1990:	70%			
1998-1999:	**Next update in 2000**	**No target set**		
1999-2000:		75%		
2009-2010:		80%		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
				Planned Improvements: The Office of Indian Education is collaborating with U.S. Bureau of Census to increase the participation of American Indians and Alaska Natives in completing the 2000 census surveys. The Office of Indian Education will collaborate with the Department of Education to identify a process for validating Office of Indian Education Performance Report data.

OBJECTIVE 2: HELP LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (LEAS) HELP THEIR STUDENTS REACH HIGH STANDARDS THROUGH THE COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS WITH ALL LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS.

2.1 Comprehensive planning for school improvement: Increasing percentages of local educational agencies (LEAs) that serve American Indian and Alaska Native students will coordinate culturally related services with core academic subjects (mathematics, reading, science, and social studies).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Data are being collected.	**Source:** Office of Indian Education Annual Performance Report, 2000.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** The Office of Indian Education's Annual Performance Report has been updated to assess the LEAs progress in implementing comprehensive planning to coordinate culturally related services to American Indian and Alaska Native students.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001.
2000:		Performance targets will be determined from the 2000 data collection.		**Validation Procedure:** Office of Indian Education Annual Performance Report data supplied by grantees, no formal validation process.
2001:		Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data:** Data are self-reported by grantees.
				Planned Improvement: Identify a benchmark for performance targets. Identify a process for validating Annual Performance Report data.

OBJECTIVE 3: DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS WILL FOCUS ON IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND SERVICES FOR AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CHILDREN AND ADULTS.

Indicator 3.1 Increasing percentages of the teacher and principal workforces serving American Indian and Alaska Native students will themselves be American Indian and Alaska Native.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of principals and teachers in public schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students				**Status:** Data are being collected. No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (1998-99 and 2000-01).
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Projects to train teachers were funded in FY 1999 for the first time since FY 1994. Because the projects are just beginning, some of the targeted number of participants will take part in these programs, and the number will increase.	*Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* Schools and Staffing Survey, 2000; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 2000–01.
	Principals	**Teachers**			
1994	13%	15%			
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuing increase**		**Validation Procedure:** Validated by National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics statistical standards.
2000:			Continuing increase		
2001:			18% of principals and 20% of teachers in public schools with high proportions of Native Americans will be American Indian or Alaska Native.		
2002:			Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Note: 1994 data was reported in the 1997 School Staffing Survey; additional data will be reported upon availability.		**Limitations of Data:** Sample size is small, and it is costly to add supplemental samples to data collection programs. National sample results in an under-representation in sample count. **Planned Improvements:** Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEA's reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Report.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued,from 1999

- Develop a more aggressive data collection process that is consistent with other Department of Education programs.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Develop and implement a research agenda that establishes baseline data on student achievement;
- Seek ways to help local educational agencies evaluate promising practices;
- Help local educational agencies evaluate the role of Native language and culture in the development of educational strategies;
- Provide technical assistance to local educational agencies on implementing research-based programs, and disseminate these promising practices to other local educational agencies;
- Coordinate with other Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs (e.g., Title I) to ensure that American Indian and Alaska Native children are achieving to the same content and performance standards for all students;
- Collaborate with state educational agencies to report disaggregated student achievement results for American Indian and Alaska Native students;
- Provide technical assistance to state educational agencies and local educational agencies to ensure comprehensive plans have included culturally related academic services to meet the culturally related needs of its American Indian and Alaska Native students;
- Implement workshops and institutes on student achievement;
- Perform onsite reviews to ensure program integrity, encourage coordination and collaboration of all program resources to help students reach high standards, and provide technical assistance to local educational agencies to improve teaching and learning for American Indian and Alaska Native students;
- Collaborate with local educational agencies to ensure American Indian and Alaska Native students have access to high-quality curricula, resources, and instruction that are aligned with challenging core academic subjects; and
- Work with other department offices to promote and fund the over-sampling of American Indian and Alaska Native respondents in education surveys.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Collaboration with Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Services; Interagency Task Force established by Executive Order 13096; state educational agencies; and Comprehensive Centers established by the Department of Education. The Office of Indian Education, through this task force, will work to consolidate and better disseminate information relevant to these populations. The task force will further enable us to help devise coordinated strategies, allowing our programs to coordinate and deliver better services to these populations.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Small population and small sample size prohibit collection of data for high school graduation rates. Many states do not report disaggregated student achievement results for American Indian and Alaska Native students. High transit population of Native students further impedes documentation and tracking of student achievement. Limited research on promising practices and teaching approaches used for American Indian and Alaska Native students.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.1 (Student attendance) and 1.4 (Student academic course completion) were dropped.
- Objective 3 (Local Education Agencies will build the capacity of school systems and Native communities) was dropped.
- Objective 4 (Assist local educational agencies to align their Indian Education programs) was dropped.
- Objective 5 (Research, evaluation, and data collection) was dropped.
- Explanation: Dropped indicators are used for tracking student progress internally.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1 was adjusted slightly for precision.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

SCHOOL RENOVATION PROGRAM

SCHOOL RENOVATION PROGRAM

Goal: To improve the condition of school facilities in communities that lack the necessary resources for school renovation.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This initiative supports Objective 1.3 (making schools strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free) by providing the resources necessary to repair the physical structure of the schools.

FY 2001—$1,300,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROGRAM ASSISTS HIGH-NEED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN MAKING URGENT RENOVATIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Program addresses urgent needs: School districts receiving program funds carry out activities that address emergency health, safety, and other renovation needs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program reports.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** Will follow ED data validation procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

Indicator 1.2 Targeting: Grant and loan funds flow to school districts that are high-poverty or meet other criteria for "high-need" (e.g., could not carry out renovations in the absence of Federal funds).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program reports.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** Will follow ED data validation procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

OBJECTIVE 2: LIMITED FEDERAL ASSISTANCE LEVERAGES MUCH GREATER STATE AND LOCAL EFFORT.

Indicator 2.1 Leveraging: Loan program results in $6 in school renovations for every $1 in Federal subsidies (net-present-value calculation under credit reform rules).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program.	**Source:** Program reports.
FY 1999:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline to be set	**Explanation:** New program.	*Next Update:* 2001.
FY 2001:		Target to be set		**Validation Procedure:** Will follow ED data validation procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Unknown.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The Department will work with Treasury to coordinate this program with school modernization bonds and Qualified Zone Academy Bonds.
- The Department will work with the Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and others to encourage school districts receiving funds to use energy-efficient and environmentally benign construction techniques.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Congressional enactment of the proposal is required.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—Not applicable.

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Goal: Help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Bilingual Education Instructional Services programs support Objective 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards) by providing grants to improve the quality and availability of teaching and learning for limited-English proficient (LEP) students.

FY 2000—$248,000,000

FY 2001—$296,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS SERVED BY TITLE VII OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT.

Indicator 1.1 English proficiency: Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on oral or written English proficiency measures.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of students made gains in English proficiency

Year	Oral		Written	
	Actual	Target	Actual	Target
FY 1998:*	91%		82%	
FY 1999:*	**84%**	**92%**	**70%**	**85%**
FY 2000:		93%		88%
FY 2001:		94%		91%

* Cohorts.

Assessment of Progress

Status: Negative trend away from target.

Explanation: The data indicate that fewer of the projects first funded in FY 1996 could show that most of their students were making gains in either oral or written English proficiency, as compared to the 1995 projects. Our target was to have more projects demonstrating that most students are making gains.

The level of missing data in both groups of reports and its effect on the results are significant concerns. Each set of data comes from a different cohort of grantees, and sets of data may not be comparable. Therefore, it is unclear whether the negative trend reported is an accurate assessment of projects' performance or is an artifact of missing data or noncomparable data.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Contracted synthesis of local project data, first funded in FY 1995 and FY 1996.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: Late 2000.

Validation Procedure: ED attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: *Limitations:* Operational definitions of LEP students vary; the amount of missing data varies greatly; grantees use different measures to test program objectives. *Planned improvements:* The program office will implement stringent annual evaluation requirements proposed by the Administration in ESEA reauthorization.

The program office will focus technical assistance and monitoring on evaluation and data quality issues, and will step up efforts to obtain missing data from grantees to enable reanalysis of the data reported here.

The program office will conduct a separate analysis on future biennial evaluation reports, separating data from grantees who have already submitted a previous evaluation report and are in their fourth year of operation from those who are submitting their first evaluation report and are in their second year of operation.

The program office continues to support research on what expected gains should be for LEP students in English proficiency, in order to construct a measure that more closely matches the indicator.

Indicator 1.2 Other academic achievement: Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on appropriate academic achievement measures of language arts, reading, and math.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of students made gains in academic achievement in language arts, reading, and math

Year	Language arts		Reading		Math	
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**
FY 1998:	62%		62%		63%	
FY 1999:	**42%**	**65%**	**53%**	**65%**	**59%**	**66%**
FY 2000:		67%		67%		68%
FY 2001:		70%		70%		70%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Negative trend away from target.

Explanation: The data indicate that fewer of the projects first funded in FY 1996 showed that most of their students were making gains in language arts, reading, and math, as compared to those first funded in FY 1995. Our target was to have more projects showing that most students are making gains in the FY 1996 cohort.

The level of missing data in both groups of reports and its effect on the results are significant concerns. Each set of data comes from a different cohort of grantees, and sets of data may not be comparable. Therefore, it is unclear whether the negative trend reported is an accurate assessment of projects' performance or is an artifact of missing data or noncomparable data.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Contracted synthesis of local project data, first funded in FY 1995 and FY 1996.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: Late 2000.

Validation Procedure: ED attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:
Limitations: Operational definitions of LEP students vary; amount of missing data varies greatly; and grantees use different measures to test program objectives. *Planned improvements:* The program office will implement stringent annual evaluation requirements proposed by the Administration in ESEA reauthorization.

The program office will focus technical assistance and monitoring on evaluation and data quality issues and will step up efforts to obtain missing data from grantees to enable reanalysis of the data reported here.

The program office will conduct a separate analysis on future biennial evaluation reports, separating data from grantees who have already submitted a previous evaluation report and are in their fourth year of operation from those who are submitting their first evaluation report and are in their second year of operation.

The program office continues to support research on what expected gains should be for LEP students in English proficiency, in order to construct a measure that more closely matches the indicator.

Indicator 1.3 Students exiting programs: Students in Title VII programs who have received bilingual education/ESL services continuously since first grade will exit those programs in 3 years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** To be determined.
1999:	**New indicator**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually (proposed).
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** This is a new indicator, and formal data will be collected this coming year. A pilot survey conducted with nine states indicated that most students transition in 3 to 4 years. Program office is developing sources for this indicator.	*Next Update:* 2001.
2001:		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** N/A.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: *Limitations:* Currently reported data are for states rather than for Title VII grantees. *Planned Improvements:* The department plans to implement language, proposed by the Administration in its ESEA reauthorization proposal, requiring that grantees annually report on reclassification reports.

OBJECTIVE 2: BUILD CAPACITY OF SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN PROGRAM TO SERVE LEP STUDENTS.

Indicator 2.1 Programs meeting standards: Each year the number of grantees meeting "criteria for model programs" will increase by 20 percent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Indicator under construction			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Annual Performance Report, June 2000; Biennial Evaluation Reports, 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1999	**New indicator**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** Program office is developing criteria for model programs. Final criteria will be available Spring 2000.	*Next Update:* Late 2000.
2000		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** N/A.
2001		No target set	Initial goal is 20 percent, but the target will be revised based on initial results.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The department is also considering developing an indicator on students' achievement after reclassification.

Indicator 2.2 Teacher training: Each year, the numbers of teachers in Title VII Systemwide and Comprehensive School Grants Program who receive quality professional development in the instruction of LEP students will increase by 20 percent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Indicator under construction			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) study, Summer 2000; Annual Performance Report, June 2000; Biennial Evaluation Reports, 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1999	**New indicator**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** Program office is developing criteria for quality inservice professional development. Final criteria will be available Spring 2000.	*Next Update:* Late 2000.
2000		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** Not Applicable
2001		No target set	Initial goal is 20 percent, but the target will be revised based on initial results.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Measure of high quality needs to be developed

OBJECTIVE 3: PROVIDE EFFECTIVE GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND IDENTIFY AND DISSEMINATE RELIABLE INFORMATION ON EFFECTIVE PRACTICES.

Indicator 3.1 Inquiries to the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE): The number of inquiries to the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education (NCBE) will increase 15 percent per year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of hits on NCBE Web site			**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Source:** NCBE Annual Performance Report, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997-98:	3,100,000		**Explanation:** The actual increase was 42 percent, exceeding the 15 percent target.	**Validation Procedure:** ED attestation process.
1998-99:	**4,409,811**	**15% increase**		
1999-00:		15% increase	The large increase may be based on these facts: (1) NCBE has significantly stepped up its outreach efforts; (2) a new client base, as the number of educational agencies that have little or no prior experience of LEP students continues to increase; and (3) awards and recognitions for the Web site as a high-quality source of information on good pedagogical practices.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** *Limitations:* Measure does not address customer satisfaction. *Planned improvements:* Disaggregation of data to examine who uses the NCBE and what types of materials are downloaded.
2000-01:		15% increase		

Indicator 3.2 More specific reporting: All states will increase their capacity to plan for and provide technical assistance by reporting more specifically on LEP programs designed to meet the educational needs of LEP students, their academic test performance, and grade retention rates.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of state educational agencies (SEAs) reporting more specific demographic and language information when completing annual SEA Title VII Survey			**Status:** Achieved 91 percent of target.	**Source:** Redesigned Summary Report of the Survey of the States' Limited-English Proficient Students and Available Educational Programs and Services, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Late 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998-99:	**51**	**56**	**Explanation:** Full analysis in progress. These data represent the first cohort of SEAs reporting on the new form.	**Validation Procedure:** Not Applicable.
1999-00:		56		
2000-01:		56	This figure represents reporting in a new survey form that asks for more information than previous forms did. SEAs often require a period of time to align their own data collection to new surveys.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Survey relies on self-reports from states; department plans to continue technical assistance on data collection issues.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 4: IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL SERVING LEP STUDENTS.

Indicator 4.1 New teachers: At least 4,000 teachers per year will complete high-quality bilingual education/English as a Second Language (ESL) certification or degree programs through the Bilingual Education Professional Development programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The new baseline is based on the first cohort of submitted biennial evaluation reports and replaces a previous baseline calculated from a 1991 study and grantee applications from 1995. The new baseline was calculated based on data from projects originally funded in 1995.	**Source:** Contracted synthesis of project data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Late 2000. **Validation Procedure:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** *Limitations:* Data based on a sample of reports; program office has to develop criteria for "high quality." *Planned improvements:* Implementing proposed new evaluation requirements; developing criteria for "high quality"; verifying data through periodic monitoring; providing guidance and technical assistance to grantees to improve the timeliness and quality of source data; and improving timeliness of data through the reauthorization proposal to replace the biennial evaluation requirement with an annual evaluation requirement.
1997:	989*			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**4,000**		
2000:		6,000		
2001:		6,000		

***Note:** According to a 1999 analysis of biennial evaluation reports from a sample of grantees first funded in FY 1995, the $5 million 1997 appropriation helped an estimated 989 teachers complete certification or degree programs.

Indicator 4.2 Bilingual fellowship program: Bilingual fellows who have completed their studies will be employed in training classroom teachers or in other positions directly related to serving LEP students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Progress toward target. **Explanation:** The high rate of employment of bilingual fellows in training classroom teachers and other areas directly related to serving LEP students is yet more evidence of the critical shortage of teachers trained to serve LEP students.	**Source:** Program database updated several times a year. Since participants are required to serve LEP students or repay the amount of the fellowship, the department maintains employment data on past fellowship participants. **Validation Procedure:** Employer confirmation obtained as necessary. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data from fellows who finished in calendar year 1999 not yet in database because of change to new software. Both 1999 and 2000 data will be entered as soon as change is complete.
1997:	92%			
1998:	92%			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**93%**		
2000:		93%		
2001:		93%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To strengthen and improve the quality of data and performance information submitted by grantees, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs will:
  - Provide training to project directors and their staff in using the Guide to Evaluation for Title VII Projects through the Regional Comprehensive Centers, Improving America's Schools conferences, and the OBEMLA Institute at the annual National Association of Bilingual Education conference.
  - Conduct a conference for evaluators and directors of Title VII projects and include training on applying the Guide to Evaluation for Title VII Projects to their performance reports and biennial evaluations.
- To further enhance and strengthen collaborative efforts, electronic links will be established between the OBEMLA Web site and those of major professional organizations.
- To better support and encourage project quality, program will strengthen technical assistance, monitoring instruments, and procedures for monitoring grants to ensure that programs focus on outcomes and accountability.
- To foster and strengthen capacity building with all grantees, technical assistance will be targeted to emphasize program features that will allow grantees to demonstrate that the support for LEP students will not diminish after the grant expires.
- To encourage and strengthen grantee efforts to improve literacy and assessment for LEP students, information on these two areas will be disseminated through the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers and the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE).
- To inform what should be appropriate gains in academic achievement and language proficiency, we will monitor and report on continuing analyses of "expected gains studies" of Limited English Proficiency students.
- To continue to monitor the academic achievement of LEP students in Title VII programs, we will continue yearly studies, aggregating project evaluation data.
- Technical assistance will be expanded to grantees to promote
  - Incorporation of LEP educational issues into the general teacher training curriculum; and
  - Partnerships between teacher training institutions and school districts.
- To continue to monitor the academic achievement of LEP students in Title VII programs, we will continue yearly studies, aggregating project evaluation data.
- Technical assistance will be expanded to grantees to promote
  - Incorporation of LEP educational issues into the general teacher training curriculum; and
  - Partnerships between teacher training institutions and school districts.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To strengthen grantee ability to share and draw upon the experiences of one another, a resource database is being established on bilingual and ESL programs.
- Conferences will be conducted on improving the quality of professional development programs, to strengthen program quality and to pursue opportunities to prepare and encourage other institutions of higher education to develop programs for training bilingual and ESL teachers.
- To review the current research regarding reading in LEP students and encourage bilingual education researchers to focus their own research in this critical and priority area, OBEMLA will conduct a research symposium on literacy.
- To further strengthen and focus grantee efforts on effective project performance, OBEMLA proposed an annual evaluation requirement, through the reauthorization proposal, to ensure more frequent data for subpart 1 (Instructional services) and subpart 3 (Professional development) programs.
- To improve the bilingual education/ESL community's access to all education research, OBEMLA will work with NCBE to link the field with Department-wide research.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To promote the highest quality in assessment and to eliminate duplication and confusion of effort, both at the Federal and the grantee level, OBEMLA is collaborating with Title I to establish and provide the best possible guidance on assessing LEP students.
- To further strengthen and promote projects of high quality, OBEMLA is sharing best practices information for serving LEP students through Title I and Migrant Education programs.
- To better assist grantees to serve LEP students with disabilities, OBEMLA is working with the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services to
  - Conduct joint research projects to strengthen and expand the knowledge database for working with LEP students with disabilities; and
  - Conduct joint conference institutes to provide grantees with technical assistance for serving LEP students with disabilities.
- To augment OBEMLA's ability to provide quality support and research, staff are working jointly with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement on projects that address LEP students, such as the NICHD/OERI project on Developing English Literacy in Spanish-speaking Students.
- To strengthen the field's capacity to address literacy needs, we are collaborating with the Reading Excellence Act (REA) to provide technical assistance to the field on helping LEP students attain literacy.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- High population mobility makes it difficult to measure program impact.
- Increasing population has brought significant demographic changes, including newer language groups and growing LEP populations in districts and states with little or no experience in serving them.
- State requirements for defining, serving, and teaching LEP students vary widely.
- Flexibility in the statute limits program office ability to direct grantees to conduct specific activities, such as training teachers under subpart 1 programs.
- Appropriate assessments for LEP students continue to be a challenge, and state policies for assessing LEP students continue to be refined.
- The extent to which issues relating to LEP students have been addressed in state standards and the alignment between those standards and programs serving LEP students vary widely.
- Lack of data around the academic achievement of former LEP students after they exit bilingual or ESL programs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 3.2 (More specific reporting: All states will increase their capacity to plan for and provide technical assistance by reporting more specifically on LEP programs designed to meet the educational needs of LEP students, their academic test performance, and grade retention rates) was reworded to make it clearer. The first part of the sentence, "All states will increase their capacity to plan for and provide technical assistance," clarifies the usefulness and purpose of more specific reporting.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.3 (Success in regular classrooms: For students who have been in the program for at least 3 years, the district will report data on achievement of LEP students compared with that of non-LEP students, and the two groups will be performing comparably) was dropped because no data or research inform whether this goal is realistic. Research shows that, on average, it takes an LEP student 3 to 5 years to attain English proficiency (depending on student characteristics). However, research does not address how long it takes LEP students to master content areas. The program office is conducting a research study to determine what gains should be expected for LEP students in English and in content areas to inform this indicator. This indicator will be revisited once study results are available.
- Indicator 2.2 (Assessments linked to standards: The number of projects that report appropriate assessments aligned to state or local standards tailored to LEP students will increase) was dropped because the indicator is premature; it needs to build on recent department work on what constitutes aligned assessments. Program office needs to develop a process for measuring this indicator. To do this, it is necessary to build on the department's guidance on alignment of standards and assessments, which has only recently been finalized. The program office plans to use this indicator for internal program monitoring purposes.
- Indicator 3.1 (Federal technical assistance: An increasing percentage of local project directors will express satisfaction with technical assistance and guidance) was dropped because it is more suited for internal management purposes than for inclusion in a public document, as it does not provide information on programs. Rather, the indicator will be incorporated into internal processes to improve the program office's capacity to provide technical assistance to clients.

New—None

FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Goal: Help students reach the national education objective of mastering one or more foreign languages.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Foreign Language Assistance Program supports Objective 1.1 (challenging standards and assessments in core academic subject areas) by providing discretionary grants to districts and states to improve foreign language instruction.

FY 2000—$8,000,000

FY 2001—$14,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY OF STUDENTS SERVED BY THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (FLAP).

Indicator 1.1 Increased student achievement: The percentage of students participating in Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP)-supported instruction who demonstrate educationally significant progress toward achieving communicative language proficiency will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Review of grantee annual reports, 1999.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** Draft data analysis report due late 2000.	*Next Update:* Late 2000.
2001:		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** ED attestation process.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: *Limitations:* There are no statutory reporting requirements. *Planned Improvements:* The reauthorization proposal institutes a yearly evaluation requirement with specific data. Additional planned improvements include disseminating information about foreign language standards and assessment, and providing guidance and technical assistance to grantees on reporting data.

OBJECTIVE 2: BUILD CAPACITY OF SCHOOLS IN FLAP TO TEACH FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

Indicator 2.1 The percentage of grantees that use national standards for determining student performance gains will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Monitoring by program office staff, 1999.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** This is a new indicator. Analysis of data is in progress.	*Next Update:* Late 2000.
2001:		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** ED attestation process.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Coordinate with Federal, state, and local programs, professional associations, and other entities to promote effective foreign language instruction to high standards.
- Support dissemination of information on effective foreign language education and related career opportunities.
- Encourage development of effective pre-service and inservice professional development for teachers of foreign languages.
- Emphasize program features that will allow grantees to carry on activities after their grants expire.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Work with professional organizations to promote the Secretary's priority for every child learning two languages.
- Expand technical assistance to establish a network linking bilingual/ESL and foreign language educators.
- Proposed an annual evaluation requirement through the reauthorization proposal.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Coordinating with Title VII, Part A, to promote two-way bilingual programs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- States vary in the extent to which they have established foreign language standards.
- No evaluation requirement during program implementation.
- Moving the field toward building strong programs that lead to communicative language proficiency.
- States and districts generally lack certification standards for elementary foreign language teachers.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 Increased student achievement. The percentage of students participating in Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP)-supported instruction who meet or exceed high standards for foreign language education will increase annually.
  Explanation: This indicator has been reworded to align it with the statutory language of improving communicative language proficiency.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1 Increased school capacity for effective instruction. At least 90 percent of grantees will maintain program activities for at least 3 school years after expiration of FLAP funding for the program.
  Explanation: This indicator provided information 3 years after programs expired, severely limiting its timeliness and usefulness.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None

Dropped—None

New—None

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EMERGENCY IMMIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

Goal: Help offset cost of supplementary services to recent immigrant students.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Emergency Immigrant Education Program supports Objective 2.4 (Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards) by providing formula grants to states to help districts that experience large increases in their student population because of immigration.

FY 2000—$150,000,000

FY 2001—$150,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS THAT SERVE LARGE NUMBERS OF RECENTLY ARRIVED IMMIGRANT STUDENTS.

Indicator 1.1 Use of funds: Ninety percent of program funds will be used for direct services to students by FY 2000.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Data source reports are required every 2 years; the most recent reports are due in November 2000.	**Source:** SEA Biennial Report, 2001. *Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* 2001. **Validation Procedure:** ED attestation process. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** *Limitations:* LEAs and SEAs have some latitude for interpretation of key terms. *Planned improvements:* Continue to refine existing procedures for followup, verification, and validation.
1995-96:	Baseline: 88.6%			
1997-98:	Data not yet available	Continuing increase		
1998-99:	**Next update in 1999-00**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:		90%		
2001-02:		Continuing increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Provide examples of uses of funds for direct services and exemplary programs for educating immigrant students.
- Work with the states to ensure high-quality and complete data in biennial reports.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Provide technical assistance to states on requirements and the state-administered grant program implementation.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Conducting joint technical assistance with bilingual education/English as a Second Language state recipients.
- Funds are typically used to enhance existing programs for immigrant students.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- No statutory requirements that funds be used for direct services.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

❖ Objective 2 and Indicator 1.2 were dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

GRANTS TO STATES AND PRESCHOOL GRANTS PROGRAMS—IDEA PART B

Goal: To improve results for children with disabilities by assisting state and local educational agencies to provide children with disabilities access to high-quality education that will help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Goal 1, (help all students reach challenging academic standards, all Objectives); Goal 2 (solid foundation for learning for all children, all Objectives); Goal 3 (ensure access to postsecondary education, Objective 3.1); Goal 4 (focus on results, quality of service, and customer satisfaction, Objectives 4.1, 4.2,and 4.3).

FY 2000—$5,379,685,000

FY 2001—$5,669,685,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ALL PRESCHOOL CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE SERVICES THAT PREPARE THEM TO ENTER SCHOOL READY TO LEARN.

Indicator 1.1 Inclusive settings: The percentage of preschool children with disabilities who are receiving special education and related services in inclusive settings (e.g., regular kindergarten, public preschool programs, Head Start, or child care facilities) will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** State-reported data.
1998-99:	**No data available**	**Baseline to be set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1999-00:		No target set	**Explanation:** Targets to be determined upon receipt of baseline data.	*Next update:* 2000.
2000-01:		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. ED's Office of Inspector General is currently conducting a review of state data reporting under IDEA Part B.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: New definitions were adopted for school year 1998-99 to improve the quality of the data.

Indicator 1.2 Readiness skills: The percentage of preschool children receiving special education and related services who have readiness skills when they reach kindergarten will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** ED study (Pre-elementary Longitudinal Study).
1998-99:	**No data available**	**N/A**		*Frequency:* 5-year intervals.
1999-00:		N/A	**Explanation:** This is a new data collection. Data are not available from another source. Baseline data will be collected in 2002-03 and will be available in 2003.	*Next update:* 2003.
2000-01:		N/A		
2002-03:		Baseline to be set		**Validation Procedure:** Data to be validated by an experienced data collection contractor.
2007-08:		No target set		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Because data are obtained from a longitudinal survey, updates will be infrequent.

OBJECTIVE 2: ALL CHILDREN WHO WOULD TYPICALLY BE IDENTIFIED AS BEING ELIGIBLE FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AT AGE 8 OR OLDER AND WHO ARE EXPERIENCING EARLY READING OR BEHAVIORAL DIFFICULTIES RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES EARLIER TO AVOID FALLING BEHIND THEIR PEERS.

Indicator 2.1 Earlier identification and intervention: The percentage of children served under IDEA ages 6 or 7, compared to ages 6 to 21, will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** State-reported data.
1997-98:	13.0%			*Frequency:* Annually.
1998-99:	**13.4%**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** In 1998-99, 13.4 percent of the children served, ages 6-21, were ages 6 or 7.	*Next update:* 2000.
1999-00:		14%		
2000-01:		15%		**Validation Procedure:** Data to be validated by an experienced data collection contractor. ED Office of Inspector General is currently conducting a review of state data reporting under IDEA Part B.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

OBJECTIVE 3: ALL CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES HAVE ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENTS, WITH APPROPRIATE ACCOMMODATIONS, SUPPORTS, AND SERVICES, CONSISTENT WITH HIGH STANDARDS.

Indicator 3.1 Regular education settings (school age): The percentage of children with disabilities ages 6 to 21 who are reported by states as being served in the regular education classroom at least 80 percent of the day will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** State-reported data.
1996-97:	45.7%			*Frequency:* Annually.
1997-98:	46.5%		**Explanation:** The 1999 target of 48 percent is not likely to be met. The 1999 target was based on a rounded figure of 46 percent for 1996-97, compared with the more precise measure of 45.7 percent. Given the large numbers of children involved in this indicator and the anticipated slow rate of change, the indicator now includes a decimal place to improve accuracy and show change. The more likely target for 1999 is 47 percent. The projected targets for 2000 and 2001 are revised accordingly.	*Next update:* 2000.
1998-99:	**No data available**	**48.0%**		
1999-00:		47.5%		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. ED Office of Inspector General is currently conducting a review of state data reporting under IDEA Part B.
2000-01:		48.0%		
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: ED will pursue strategies to decrease the amount of time between collection, reporting, and availability of data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indicator 3.2 Performance on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): The percentage of students with disabilities who meet or exceed basic levels in reading, math, and science in the NAEP will increase. The number of students with disabilities who do not meet basic standards will decrease. The percentage of students who are excluded from the NAEP because of their disabilities will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Actual Performance (1996): *Percentage who met or exceeded basic levels*

Grade	Reading	Math	Science
4th	N/A	43.3%	38.6%
8th	N/A	16.8%	16.7%
12th	N/A	9.4%	16.3%

Actual Performance (1996): *Number who did not meet basic level*

Grade	Reading	Math	Science
4th	N/A	172,897	200,773
8th	N/A	208,813	176,944
12th	N/A	87,055	71,847

Actual Performance (1996): *Percentage excluded from NAEP*

Grade	Reading	Math	Science
4th	N/A	4%	6%
8th	N/A	3%	4%
12th	N/A	3%	3%

Performance Targets

1998-99:	**No target set**
1999-00:	Continuous improvement
2000-01:	Continuous improvement

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge.

Explanation: Data are new. Until further analysis, it is inappropriate to establish targets at this time.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).
Frequency: Varies, depending on subject area.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Verified by the Department of ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data on children with disabilities who meet or exceed basic standards and those who do not meet basic standards are based on very small sample sizes.

Indicator 3.3 Suspensions or expulsions: The percentage of children with disabilities who are subject to long-term suspension or expulsion, unilateral change in placement, or change in placement if their current placement is likely to result in injury to someone, will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**
1999-00:		No target set
2000-01:		No target set

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge.

Explanation: These data were first collected during school year 1998-99, were reported by states in November 1999, and will be available by summer 2000.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: State-reported data.
Frequency: Annually.
Next update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data to be validated by an experienced data collection contractor. ED Office of Inspector General is currently conducting a review of state data reporting under IDEA Part B.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

OBJECTIVE 4: SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE THE SUPPORT THEY NEED TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL PREPARED FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION OR EMPLOYMENT.

Indicator 4.1 Graduation: The percentage of children with disabilities exiting school with a regular high school diploma will increase, and the percentage who drop out will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Graduate**		**Drop out**		**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** State-reported data.
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1995-96:	52.6%		34.1%		**Explanation:** From 1996-97 to 1997-98, the number of children with disabilities who graduated with a high school diploma increased from 53.5 percent to 55.4 percent, while the number who dropped out decreased from 32.7 percent to 31 percent. Figures do not total to 100 percent because some children exit school in other ways, such as graduating with a certificate or aging out.	*Next update:* 2001.
1996-97:	53.5%		32.7%			
1997-98:	55.4%		31.0%			**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. ED's Office of Inspector General is currently reviewing state data reporting under IDEA Part B.
1998-99:	**No data available**	**56%**	**No data available**	**31%**		
1999-00:		57%		30%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Children who move and who are not known to continue services are not included in these numbers.
2000-01:		58%		29%		

Indicator 4.2 Postsecondary education: The percentage of students with disabilities who are enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, including 2-year community colleges and technical schools, within 2 years of leaving high school will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** National Longitudinal Transition Study II.
1987:	14%			*Frequency:* Two collections, 5-year interval.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** In school year 1986-87, 14 percent of students with disabilities were enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, including 2-year community colleges and technical schools, within 2 years of leaving high school. (Source: National Longitudinal Transition, Study I). Because no longitudinal study on this population has been conducted since 1987, there are no data to report for the period until 2004, when the next study will yield results. However, NCES reports that 6 percent of undergraduates in postsecondary education reported having a disability.	*Next update:* 2004.
2004:		20%		**Validation Procedure:** Data to be validated by an experienced data collection contractor.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Because data are obtained from a longitudinal survey, updates will be infrequent.

417

OBJECTIVE 5: STATES ARE ADDRESSING THEIR NEEDS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONSISTENT WITH THEIR COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT (CSPD).

Indicator 5.1 Qualified personnel: The number of states and outlying areas where at least 90 percent of special education teachers are fully certified will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**No. of States Serving Ages 3-5**		**No. States Serving Ages 6-21**		**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** State-reported data.
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1995-96:	34		39		**Explanation:** (1) The decrease in the number of states serving ages 6 to 21 between 1995-96 and 1996-97 may reflect the clustering of states around the 90 percent goal in the indicator. This clustering may result in unpredictable changes from year to year; however, evidence of a positive trend is expected to be evident over a 5-to7-year period. (2) The 1998-99 target of 44 states for ages 6 to 21 was determined prior to receipt of 1996-97 and 1997-98 data. Given the actual performance for those 2 years, a realistic adjusted target for 1998-99 is 41 states. The 2000 and 2001 targets have been adjusted.	*Next update:* Collect 1998-99; available 2000.
1996-97:	36		38			**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. ED Office of Inspector General is currently conducting a review of state data reporting under IDEA Part B.
1997-98:	38		40			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**40**	**No data available**	**44**		
1999-00:		41		42		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** ED plans to expand this indicator in 2002, after data collection procedures are implemented, to include the number of teachers who are certified in the areas in which they are teaching.
2000-01:		42		43		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Conduct research on early and prescriptive assessments of children, ages 3 to 9, with learning or emotional disabilities.
- Demonstrate effective models for addressing the needs of children, ages 3 to 9, with developmental delays in the areas of reading and behavior.
- Conduct research on instructional interventions and results for children with disabilities by describing, testing, and validating instructional practices that have the potential for generating positive results for children with disabilities as they strive to meet state and local standards and performance goals set for all children—preschool, elementary, middle, and high school.
- Conduct research on the inclusion of students with disabilities in large-scale assessment programs to determine the best ways state and local educational agencies can meet the requirements of IDEA regarding participation in assessments and to study the effects of efforts made by these agencies to meet these requirements. Conduct research to improve literacy results for children who are unresponsive to effective classroom or schoolwide programs in grades K–3.
- Conduct research to improve reading comprehension results for children with disabilities in grade clusters K-2, 3-5, and 6-8.
- Support a technical assistance center for improving the participation of students with disabilities in state and local accountability systems.
- Support a technical assistance and dissemination project focusing on secondary education and transitional services.
- Support parent information centers, provide technical assistance, disseminate information, and train personnel and parents on practices to improve educational results.
- Monitor states to ensure that children with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education if suspended or expelled.
- Conduct research, provide technical assistance, and disseminate information on addressing behavioral problems in children with disabilities in a timely manner.
- Support professional development on addressing behavior for children with disabilities.
- Support state reform efforts through State Improvement Grants.
- Conduct research, provide technical assistance, and disseminate information on appropriate accommodations for assessments, alternative assessments, performance goals, and interpretation of assessment results.
- Inform parents of assessment requirements through parent training and information dissemination.
- Monitor State Improvement Grants and State Comprehensive Systems of Personnel Development (CSPDs) to ensure that states are addressing personnel needs.
- Support personnel development activities, including preparing personnel and developing model teacher-preparation programs.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Monitor to ensure that states include children with disabilities in assessments, including alternate assessments when appropriate.
- Monitor states and take appropriate corrective action to ensure that states fulfill their general supervision responsibilities, including the identification and correction of deficiencies and operation of an effective dispute resolution system.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Within the Department, staff from IDEA and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) confer prior to Part B monitoring visits to determine whether there are any major OCR issues in states or districts being monitored. Staff also collaborate with the Rehabilitative Services Administration to determine whether any issues of concern to both agencies can be addressed through monitoring.
- The Department is working with the Department of Health and Human Services to determine ways to provide Medicaid funding for school-based medical services.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

Major challenges include:

- the provision of an adequate supply of special education and related services personnel to serve children with disabilities;
- adequate preparation of regular education and special education teachers to serve children with disabilities in regular and special education settings;
- development of adequate systems of interagency collaboration to serve children with disabilities, particularly secondary and transition-age children;
- providing the positive behavioral supports necessary for children to succeed in education programs; and
- improving the participation of children with disabilities, particularly those in secondary schools, in the regular education curriculum.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- FY 1999 Indicator 2.2, Appropriately trained personnel, has been revised to focus on the number of states where at least 90 percent of special education teachers are fully certified (FY 2001 Indicator 5.1).
- FY 1999 Indicator 4.1, Participation in the regular classroom, has been modified in FY 2001 Indicator 3.1 (regular education settings) to focus on the percentage of children who are served in the regular education classroom at least 80 percent of the day.
- FY 1999 Indicator 7.1, Disciplinary actions, has been modified in FY 2001 Indicator 3.3 (suspension and expulsion) to focus on the specific data that are reported by states under Part B of IDEA.
- FY 1999 Indicator 7.2, Children with emotional disturbance, has been modified in FY 2001 Indicator 2.1 to measure the increase in the percentage of children ages 6 or 7 who are counted under Part B as receiving services, as a way to determine whether children with emotional disturbance are identified earlier.

Dropped

- Performance goals and strategies.
- Participation in assessments.
- Participation in alternative assessments.
- 2.1 Emergency/temporary certification.
- 2.3 Reciprocity.
- 3.1 State monitoring.
- 3.2 State technical assistance.
- 5.1 Participation in appropriate secondary education.
- 6.1 Parent satisfaction.
- 6.2 Teachers' views.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- FY 2000 Indicator 1.1, Graduation and school completion, has been clarified to measure the percentage of children who graduate with a *high school* diploma.
- FY 2000 Indicator 1.2, Performance on assessments, has been changed from measuring the gap in scores between children with disabilities and children without disabilities, to measuring the extent to which children with disabilities meet or exceed basic standards or are excluded from NAEP.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Dropped

The following FY 2000 indicators have been removed from the report, pending receipt of viable performance data:

- 3.1: Improved earnings.
- 5.2: Parent satisfaction.
- 7.1: Participation in assessments.
- 9.1: Correct deficiencies.

New

- 1.2 Readiness skills.

INFANTS AND TODDLERS WITH DISABILITIES–IDEA PART C

Goal: Family and child outcomes are enhanced by early intervention services, and states provide a comprehensive system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: All students reach challenging academic standards including Objectives 1.4, 1.5 and 1.7; Goal 2 (build a solid foundation for learning), including Objectives 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4; Goal 4 (focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction), including Objectives 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4.

FY 2000—$375,000,000

FY 2001—$383,567,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ALL INFANTS AND TODDLERS WITH DISABILITIES AND THEIR FAMILIES WILL RECEIVE EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES IN NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS THAT MEET THEIR INDIVIDUAL NEEDS.

Indicator 1.1 Infants and toddlers served: The percentage of children ages birth through 2 who are served under Part C will increase as a proportion of the general population in this age range, while the number of states that serve less than 2 percent of the general population of the state in this age range will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Part C count as percentage of 0-2 U.S. population**		**Less than 2 percent of state's population**		**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** State data reports.
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**	**Explanation:** The apparent decrease in the percentage of population served from 1997-98 to 1998-99 is attributable to a significant overcount in 1997-98 in a single state. Adjusting for this overcount would reduce the actual percentage of children served in 1997-98 from 1.69 percent to 1.55 percent, and would increase the number of states serving less than 2 percent of the state's population from 39 to 40. Therefore, a positive trend is evident in the percentage of children served in 1998-99. No change is evident in the number of states serving less than 2 percent of the state's population.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Because of the lack of general population data for Puerto Rico and the outlying areas, this indicator includes data from only the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Also, varying data collection methods and definitions among states may cause unpredictable variations in counts.
1997-98:	1.69%		39 states			
1998-99:	**1.59%**	**Continuous improvement**	**40 states**	**Continuous improvement**		
1999-00:		1.61%		38 states		
2000-01:		1.62%		37 states		
2001-02:		1.64%		36 states		

425

424

Indicator 1.2 Infants under 1 year of age served: The percentage of children under 1 year of age served under Part C, as a proportion of the general population in this age range, will increase, while the number of states that serve less than 0.3 percent of the general population of the state in this age range will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Percent of the general U.S. population**		**Less than 0.3 percent of state's population**		**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** State data reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000.
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**	**Explanation:** The apparent decrease in the percentage of population from 1997-98 to 1998-99 is attributable to a significant overcount of children in a single state. Adjusting for this overcount would reduce the actual percentage of children served in 1997-98 from 0.89 percent to 0.72 percent, and would increase the number of states serving less than 0.3 percent of the state's population from 34 to 35. Therefore, there is a positive trend.	**Validation Procedure:** Verified by Dept. of ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
1997-98	0.89%		34 states			
1998-99:	**0.79%**	**Continuous improvement**	**36 states**	**Continuous improvement**		**Limitations of Data and Planned improvement:** Because of the lack of general population data for Puerto Rico and the outlying areas, this indicator includes data from only the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Also, varying data collection methods and definitions among states may cause unpredictable variations in counts.
1999-00:		0.80%		35 states		
2000-01:		0.82%		34 states		
2001-02:		0.84%		33 states		

Indicator 1.3 Service settings: The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate services primarily in home, in community-based settings, and in programs designed for typically developing peers will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** State-reported data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000.
1995-96:	56%		**Explanation:** This measure provides an indication of the extent to which infants and toddlers are receiving services in the natural environment.	**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by an experienced data collection contractor.
1996-97:	58%			
1997-98:	63%			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** ED will pursue strategies to decrease the time lags between collection, reporting, and availability of data.
1999-00:		67%		
2000-01:		69%		
2001-02:		71%		

Indicator 1.4 Referral to services: The percentage of children leaving Part C services with referral to preschool or other services will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** IDEA state-reported data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000.
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**	**Explanation:** This new data collection will count children leaving Part C services whose eligibility for Part B services is not determined, or who are found ineligible for Part B services but are provided no referral. Baseline data collected in 1997-98 will be available in 2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Data to be validated by an experienced data collection contractor.
1999-00:		No target set		
2000-01:		No target set		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** New state data requirement typically requires 5 years to achieve reliability.

OBJECTIVE 2: CHILDREN'S FUNCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS ENHANCED BY EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES.

Indicator 2.1 Functional abilities: The percentage of children participating in the Part C program who demonstrate improved and sustained functional abilities will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study.
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		*Frequency:* Twice, with a 3-year interval.
1999-00:		No target set	**Explanation:** A contract to obtain data is under way. Data collected in 2003-04 will provide the baseline for this indicator.	*Next update:* 2005.
2000-01:		No target set		
2003-04:		Baseline to be set		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
2006-07:		No target set		
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Because data are obtained from a longitudinal survey, updates will occur slowly.

Indicator 2.2 Family capacity: The percentage of families that report that early intervention services have increased their family's capacity to enhance their child's development will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study.
1997-98:	No data available			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** Baseline data collected in 1997-98 will be available in 2000.	*Frequency:* 5-year interval.
1999-00:		No target set		*Next update:* 2000.
2000-01:		No target set		
2002-03:		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** Data to be validated by internal review procedures of an experienced data collection contractor.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Because data are obtained from a longitudinal survey, updates will occur slowly.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Conduct demonstration and outreach projects on effective practices for identifying children and families who qualify for services.
- Provide targeted technical assistance and disseminate information on effective "child find" practices, focusing on states that identify and serve low percentages of children and families.
- Convene a panel of experts to evaluate and recommend ways of bringing greater uniformity to the definition of developmental delay.
- Monitor state practices and state applications to ensure that the child and family receive timely, appropriate, individualized services based on the needs identified in a comprehensive, multidisciplinary assessment.
- Conduct research to identify effective practices for providing and coordinating services in ways that are cost-effective and comprehensive and that support the family's needs.
- Conduct research, provide technical assistance, and disseminate information on effective home visiting and other practices that increase families' capacity to care for their children.
- Support and encourage Parents Training and Information Centers (PTIs) and community resource centers in serving families of eligible children from birth to age 3.
- Encourage an emphasis on transition in the state self-assessment process as part of monitoring activities.
- Provide technical assistance and disseminate information on effective transition practices, with particular focus on transitioning children to natural community-based settings.
- Work with the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council to improve transitions into and out of programs that serve children with disabilities and their families.
- Ensure that all Office of Special Education Programs Clearinghouses, where appropriate, provide timely, understandable, and useful information to families of eligible children from birth to age 3.
- Conduct research to determine short- and long-range child outcomes and to determine how developmentally appropriate practices can be conducted within family-friendly models (e.g., Institute on Early Childhood Program Performance Measures).

New or Strengthened Strategies

- The Federal Interagency Coordinating Council created a task force that successfully resolved issues regarding conflicting requirements between the Department of Defense CHAMPUS/TRICARE program and the Department of Education's Grants for Infants and Families program.
- The Federal Interagency Coordinating Council, together with the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant Program and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), launched a collaborative program, called Communities Can, to support and recognize the efforts of local communities to bring families, businesses, service providers, community leaders, and neighbors together to ensure that communities nurture and support all children and families.
- The Federal Interagency Coordinating Council, in conjunction with the Child Care Bureau, held a national teleconference to solicit input from the field regarding child care policy and the needs of children with disabilities.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The Federal Interagency Coordinating Council (FICC) was established under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1991 to ensure the effective coordination of Federal early intervention and preschool programs and policies across Federal agencies. The Federal Interagency Coordinating Council is composed of 19 Federal agencies and programs, including 12 agencies within HHS. These agencies have actively participated in Federal Interagency Coordinating Council activities.
- The Federal Interagency Coordinating Council also created a task force to address issues that have developed regarding managed care and the requirement in Part B of IDEA that services for children with disabilities ages birth through 2 be provided in natural environments, and to address regional variations in determining what early intervention services are eligible for reimbursement under Title XIX.
- The Federal Interagency Coordinating Council was instrumental in bringing agencies together behind CHIP and has actively supported Federal outreach efforts around CHIP. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) and HHS also jointly developed a training packet, entitled Ensure Kids Now, that explains the purpose of the program and how states and local governments can implement this program, which ensures quality health care services for children without health insurance.
- The Department of Defense, Centers for Disease Control, National Institutes of Health, and Health Resource Services Administration worked together to develop a collaboration plan to ensure that newborn infants receive hearing screenings and follow-up services in a timely manner.
- The Department of Justice is currently soliciting applications for the Safe Start Demonstration Project, an initiative to prevent and reduce the impact of family and community violence on young children, primarily from birth to 6 years of age, which was developed by the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in collaboration with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and the Department of Education.
- OSERS and HCFA plan to provide State Medical Officers with joint guidance and technical assistance regarding reimbursement issues related to children with disabilities and are working on plans for a Medicaid Summit to address eligibility and services issues related to young children with disabilities.

How This Program Coordinates with Other Federal Activities (continued)

- The Office of Special Education Programs is working through the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council on sharing pertinent program data among agencies with early childhood programs, which would assist each with its respective monitoring efforts. This might also include joint training of staff and opportunities to accompany Office of Special Education Programs staff on monitoring visits. This spring, a staff member from MCH joined Office of Special Education Programs early childhood staff in the first such joint monitoring visit. Program staff are pursuing further collaboration in this area.
- The Office of Special Education Programs staff have been actively involved with the advisory board for the joint Conrad Hilton Foundation/Head Start Technical Assistance Project and have conducted trainings for Early Head Start, Migrant Head Start, and Head Start on disability issues. Office of Special Education Programs staff have also been active on the HHS Interagency Council on Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- Federal assistance needed for states to develop systems.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- FY 1999 Indicator 2.2 (Natural settings) was modified in FY 2001 Indicator 1.3 (Service settings) to reflect pertinent data that are already being collected.
- FY 1999 Indicator 2.4 (Transition experiences) was modified in the FY 2001 Indicator 1.4 (Referral to services) to reflect the actual data that are being collected to measure this indicator.

Dropped

- FY 1999 Indicator 1.3 (States serving at-risk children) was deleted in FY 2000 because of the great variation in states' definitions of at-risk children and the consequent difficulty in obtaining meaningful data on this measure.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- FY 2000 Indicators 1.1 (Total number of children served) and 1.2 (Early identification) have been changed to measure the number of states that meet targets, rather than measure a national total of children served, to reinforce the state-administered nature of this program. These indicators have also been expanded to measure the number of states that serve at least a minimum percentage of children in their state under this program.
- FY 2000 Indicator 2.3 (Setting of subsequent services) has been renamed "Referral to services" and modified to measure the extent to which children leaving Part C services have a referral to preschool or other services.

Dropped

The following FY 2000 indicators have been removed from the report. The only way to collect this data is through longitudinal studies. While this data is useful for assessing program performance, it is not sufficiently informative for an annual plan.

- FY 2000 Indicator 2.1 (Receipt of all services indicated).
- FY 2000 Indicator 4.1 (Funding sources).
- FY 2000 Indicator 4.2 (Parental satisfaction).

New—None.

NATIONAL ACTIVITIES–IDEA PART D

Goal: To link best practices to states, school systems, and families to improve results for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Goal 1 (all students reach challenging academic standards), including Objectives 1.4, 1.5, and 1.7; Goal 2 (build a solid foundation for learning), including Objectives 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4; Goal 4 (focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction), including Objectives 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4.

FY 2000—$281,511,000

FY 2001—$315,589,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROGRAMS RESPOND TO CRITICAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES AND THEIR FAMILIES.

Indicator 1.1 Responsive to critical needs: The percentage of IDEA program activities that are determined by expert panels to respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families will increase. (a) Research and innovation, (b) Technology, (c) Personnel preparation, (d) Technical assistance, and (e) State improvement.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of program priorities					**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Expert panels. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000.
	1999 Actual	**1999 Target**	**2000 Target**	**2001 Target**	**Explanation:** Baseline data to be available in 2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by internal review procedures of an experienced data collection contractor.
Research and innovation: Technology: Personnel preparation: Technical assistance: State improvement:	**No data available**	**No target set**	No target set	N/A		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** All five program areas will be assessed by expert panels in 2000. A pilot was conducted in 1999 to determine the validity of the expert panel approach.

OBJECTIVE 2: PROJECTS USE HIGH-QUALITY METHODS AND MATERIALS.

Indicator 2.1 Highest standards for methods and materials: Expert panels determine that IDEA-funded projects use exceedingly high-quality methods and materials. (a) Research and innovation (b) Technology (c) Personnel preparation (d) Technical assistance (e) State improvement.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of projects that meet exceptionally high standards		1999 Actual	1999 Target	2000 Target	2001 Target	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** To be funded, each project must use high-quality methods and materials. This indicator identifies projects that use exceptionally rigorous research and evaluation methodology. Baseline data on one program area were collected in 1999. Data on remaining programs (technology, personnel preparation, technical assistance, and state improvement) will be collected in 2000.	**Source:** Project applications. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Instrumentation will be expanded to include all five-program areas in FY 2000.
Research and innovation	Research:	**60%**	**No target set**	65%	67%		
	Demonstration:	**12%**	**No target set**	20%	24%		
	Outreach:	**20%**	**No target set**	25%	28%		

OBJECTIVE 3: PROJECTS COMMUNICATE APPROPRIATELY AND PRODUCTS ARE USED TO IMPROVE RESULTS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES AND THEIR FAMILIES.

Indicator 3.1 Communication with target audiences: The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that communicate appropriately with target audiences will increase. (a) Research and innovation (b) Technology (c) Personnel preparation (d) Technical assistance

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of projects that communicate with target audiences	1999 Actual	1999 Target	2000 Target	2001 Target	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Target to be determined upon receipt of baseline data in 2000.	**Source:** Expert panels. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000 (baseline). **Validation Procedure:** Data validated by an experienced data collection contractor. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Because of the need to collect data 3 years after expiration of projects, there will be a time lag in collecting performance data.
Research and innovation: Technology: Personnel preparation: Technical assistance:	**No data available**	**No target set**	Baseline to be set	N/A		

Indicator 3.2 Practitioners use results: Expert panels determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities. (a) Research and innovation (b) Technology (c) Personnel preparation (d) Technical assistance (e) State improvement

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of expert panel with positive determination	1999 Actual	1999 Target	2000 Target	2001 Target	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Baseline data on two program areas were collected in 1999. Data on remaining programs will be collected 2000.	**Source:** Project applications. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Baseline sample may not be sufficient to make generalizations to the universe
Research and innovation	**N/A**	**No target set**	No target set	No target set		
Technology:	**78%**	**No target set**	89%	89%		
Personnel Preparation:	**N/A**	**No target set**	No target set	No target set		
Technical assistance:	**67%**	**No target set**	78%	89%		
State improvement:	**N/A**	**No target set**	No target set	No target set		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		of stakeholders. However, the expert panel represents a broad range of constituents. The structure and quality of expert panel will improve with experience. Also, expert panels starting in FY 2000 will assess all five-program areas.

OBJECTIVE 4: PERSONNEL ARE PREPARED TO SERVE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

Indicator 4.1 Persons trained to serve children with disabilities: The percentage of persons who obtain their degrees with IDEA support and serve children with disabilities as teachers, early intervention personnel, related services personnel, or leadership personnel within 3 years of receiving their degrees will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Survey.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually, starting in 2002.
2002:		No target set	**Explanation:** Data collection is authorized by a new regulatory requirement (December 1999). Baseline data will begin to be collected in 1999, but data collection for baseline will not be completed until 2002 because of the time lag inherent in the indicator.	*Next update:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data validated by an experienced data collection contractor. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

Indicator 4.2 Grants to minority institutions: The percentage of IDEA grants for personnel preparation awarded to Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority institutions, including tribal colleges, will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of all personnel-preparation awards (new and continuation) that went to minority institutions			**Status:** Positive movement toward goal.	**Source:** Analysis of project information.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1997:	15.4%			*Next update:* 2000.
1998:	17.7%		**Explanation:** The significant increase in awards from 1998 to 1999 reflects a decrease in the number of awards going to nonminority institutions, combined with an increase in the average size of the awards going to nonminority institutions	
1999:	**26.4%**	**No target set**		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
2000:		28%		
2001:		Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

Indicator 4.3 Minority and disabled personnel: The percentage of personnel who are minority and the percentage who are disabled who receive financial assistance for training under IDEA will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Project performance reports.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		No target set	**Explanation:** Target to be determined upon receipt of baseline data.	*Next Update:* 2000.
2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data to be validated by internal review procedures of an experienced data collection staff.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

OBJECTIVE 5: FAMILIES RECEIVE INFORMATION ABOUT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

Indicator 5.1 Increase in informed families: The percentage of families that report that the training and technical assistance received from the Parent Information and Training Centers made a positive difference in their child's supports and services will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Project performance data.
1998:	71%			*Frequency:* Annually.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** Performance target data not yet available.	*Next update:* 2000.
2000:		**75%**		
2001:		76%		**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Self-report by projects may hamper validity. OSEP will verify results with follow-up survey.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Conduct comprehensive planning that includes formal and informal meetings and surveys with a wide variety of stakeholders to obtain information on critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.
- Provide information and technical assistance through meetings, conferences, and policy guidance regarding implementation of the personnel-preparation service-obligation requirements.
- Provide competitive preferences in grant competitions for first-time grantees to increase the number of minority entities receiving grants.
- Provide competitive preferences in grant competitions to encourage increased services to underrepresented populations.
- Increase the number of community parent-resource centers to increase the impact of parent information activities on minority families.
- Assess alternative technical assistance and dissemination approaches and identify effective strategies that respond to customer needs.
- Develop coordinated, collaborative strategies with other ED-funded providers of technical assistance and information.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Include a requirement in grant notices for research and technology projects to employ rigorous quantitative and qualitative research methods.
- Include a requirement in grant notices for technical assistance and personnel-preparation projects to employ high-quality research-validated practices and materials.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- Department of Justice to jointly fund the Center for Students with Disabilities involved or at risk of involvement with the Juvenile Justice System.
- Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS) to support the comprehensive community mental health services for children and adolescents with emotional disturbance by providing training and technical assistance to CMHS-sponsored grantees.
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention to provide technical and scientific assistance on issues related to the design, analysis, and evaluation of a state-based surveillance system for case finding and tracking of children with disabilities.
- National Council on Disability to conduct a meeting of youth with disabilities concerning economic independence and transition to adult life, and another to develop and support leadership opportunities targeted for people with disabilities.
- Office of Educational Research and Improvement at the U.S. Department of Education to support an Early Childhood Pedagogy study.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- Identifying effective ways to help service providers in states and local school districts obtain and use information that results from IDEA research and innovation projects.
- Identifying strategies to increase the involvement of persons with disabilities and from minority backgrounds in the provision of early intervention and special education services.
- Improving collaboration between IDEA activities and those of other Federal agencies involved in assisting children with disabilities and their families.
- Increasing the quality and amount of information provided to parents of children with disabilities to help them participate fully in the planning and delivery of services for their children.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- FY 1999 Indicators 1.2 (research-validated effective practices), 2.2 (ensure quality), and 3.4 (use effective practices) have been consolidated into FY 2001 Indicator 2.1 (highest standards for methods and materials).
- FY 1999 Indicator 3.1 (customer satisfaction) has been incorporated into FY 2001 Indicator 3.1 (communication with target audiences).
- FY 1999 Indicator 3.2 (improving practices) has been incorporated into FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (practitioners use results).
- FY 1999 Indicator 3.3 (respond to information needs) has been revised to measure the extent to which IDEA-funded activities respond to critical needs of children with disabilities (FY 2001 Indicator 1.1).

Dropped

- FY 1999 Indicators 1.1 (supply of qualified personnel), 1.3 (personnel employed with certification), and 1.5 (effective personnel) have been removed from the IDEA Part D performance measures and have been consolidated and moved to IDEA Part B Grants to States Indicator 5.1 (qualified personnel).
- FY 1999 Indicator 1.4 (special education training for regular education teachers) has been removed from the performance plan pending the collection of viable performance data.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year)

Adjusted

- FY 2000 Indicator 1.1 (rigorous research) has been expanded in FY 2001 Indicator 2.1 (highest standards for methods and materials) to measure both the use of rigorous research in research and technology programs as well as the use of research-validated practices and materials in personnel preparation, technical assistance, and state implementation grant activities.
- FY 2000 Indicator 1.2 (communicate findings) has been expanded in FY 2001 Indicator 3.1 (communication with target audiences) to include the following IDEA programs in addition to technology: research and innovation; personnel preparation; and technical assistance.
- FY 2000 Indicators 2.1 (consumer impact—personnel preparation) and 4.1 (consumer impact—technical assistance) have been consolidated in FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (consumers' use results) and expanded to include the following programs: personnel preparation; research and innovation; and state improvement
- FY 2000 Indicator 3.1 (reduce shortages) has been modified in FY 2001 Indicator 4.1 (persons trained to serve children with disabilities) to focus on the extent to which individuals trained under Part D grants eventually serve children with disabilities.

Dropped

- FY 2000 Indicator 5.1 (supply of qualified personnel) has been deleted to avoid duplicating Part B IDEA Indicator 5.1 (qualified personnel).
- FY 2000 Indicator 6.1 (families served) has been removed from the FY 2001 report pending collection of viable performance data.

New—None

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

STATE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES (INCLUDING SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT)

Goal: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 (lifelong learning) ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

FY 2000--$2,353,739,000

FY 2001--$2,413,944,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO ARE SERVED BY THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (VR) STATE GRANT PROGRAM ACHIEVE EMPLOYMENT CONSISTENT WITH THEIR PARTICULAR STRENGTHS, RESOURCES, ABILITIES, CAPABILITIES, AND INTERESTS.

Indicator 1.1 Number achieving employment: The number of individuals with disabilities who achieve employment will increase by at least 1% annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of individuals who achieved an employment outcome			**Status:** The 1999 data are expected to be available by March 2000. We expect the data to show that we have achieved our target.	**Source:** Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) State data from the R-113. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* March 2000
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	211,503			
1998:	223,668 (5.8%)*			
1999:	**No data available**	**215,770**	**Explanation:** FY 1999 target was surpassed in FY 1998. There was a significant increase in the number of individuals who achieved an employment outcome in FY 1998. In prior years, the annual percentage change has varied considerably. The average annual increase for FYs 1994 to 1997 was 1.2 percent.	**Validation Procedure:** Verified by Dept of ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
2000:		228,160		
2001:		230,450		
* Note: The number in parentheses indicates the percent change in the number of individuals achieving an employment outcome from the previous year.				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Appropriate crosschecks and edits to verify and validate the quality of these data are in place, but not well documented. Written procedures will be developed for the collection, cleaning and analysis of data.

Indicator 1.2 Percentage of individuals obtaining employment: The percentage of all persons served who obtain employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage obtaining employment			**Status:** The 1999 data are expected to be available by March 2000. We expect the data to show that we have achieved our target.	**Source:** RSA State data from the R-113. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* March 2000
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	61.2%			
1998:	62.2%			
1999:	**No data available**	**61%**	**Explanation**: From fiscal years 1994 – 1997, the percentage of individuals receiving services who obtained employment remained steady at around 61 percent. In FY 1998, the percentage of individuals who obtained an employment outcome increased to 62 percent, exceeding our 1999 and 2000 target for this indicator. We	**Validation Procedure:** Verified by Dept of ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
2000:		62.7%		
2001:		63%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as discussed under indicator 1.1.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	have established new 2000 and 2001 targets for these indicators based on performance in 1998.	

Indicator 1.3 Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment: Of individuals obtaining employment, the percentage who obtain competitive employment will increase. Among individuals with significant disabilities obtaining employment, the percentage obtaining competitive employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of all individuals with disabilities who obtained competitive employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	81.2% (171, 743)*	
1998:	80.1% (179,154)*	
1999:	**No data available**	82.3%
2000:		82.5%
2001:		82.7%

Percentage of individuals with significant disabilities who obtained competitive employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	79.1% (134,736)*	
1998:	78.6% (143,026)*	
1999:	**No data available**	80.0%
2000:		80.5%
2001:		80.7%

* Note: The number in parentheses indicates the actual number of competitive employment outcomes.

Assessment of Progress

Status: The 1999 data are expected to be available by September 2000. We expect the data to show that progress toward the target has been made.

Explanation: The 1998 data show a small decline in the percentage; however, the actual numbers increased. In September 1997, the Federal minimum wage increased from $4.75 to $5.15. Because, under this program, individuals must be earning at least the minimum wage to, in part, meet the criteria for competitive employment, the change in the minimum wage has affected performance on this indicator.

The FY 1999 target established in 1998 for individuals with significant disabilities was set at a low level based on an error in the 1997 data. Data for FY 1997 have been corrected and targets for the years 1999 through 2001 have been adjusted accordingly.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: RSA State data from the R-911.
Frequency: Annually
Next Update: September 2000

Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept of ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Accuracy/consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees (respondents). Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.

Written procedures will be developed for the collection, cleaning and analysis of data. Publication of final regulations implementing the Standards and Indicators under section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act will provide a method to ensure timeliness of data reporting on the part of 80 grantees. Steps will also be taken to improve reasonableness checks of data.

Indicator 1.4 Improved earnings: Among individuals exiting the program in competitive employment, the median ratio of their average hourly wage to the state's average hourly wage for all individuals in the state who are employed will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Median ratio for general and combined agencies

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	0.57	
1998:	0.57	
1999:	**No data available**	**0.57**
2000:		0.58
2001:		0.58

Assessment of Progress

Status: We expect the target to be met in 1999.

Explanation: The 1999 data are expected to be available by September 2000. We expect the data to show that the target was achieved.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: RSA State data from the R-911. Department of Labor data on State average hourly wage.
Frequency: Annually
Next Update: September 2000

Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept of ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same limitations and planned improvements reported under 1.3 apply to this indicator. In addition, the data for this indicator is limited by the fact that the required comparison involves numbers reported from two different sets of State reported data.

Indicator 1.5 Own income as primary support: The percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining employment that their own income is their primary source of support will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining employment that their own income is their primary source of support	**Status:** The 1999 data are expected to be available by September 2000. We expect the data to show that progress toward the target has been made.	**Source:** RSA State data from the R-911. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* September 2000

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	74.5% (157,691)*	
1998:	73.7% (164,918)*	
1999:	**No data available**	**74.5%**
2000:		75%
2001:		75%

* Note: The number in parentheses indicates the actual number of individuals whose own income is their primary source of support.

Explanation: The 1998 data show a small decline in the percentage; however, the actual numbers increased. Therefore, we expect the 1999 target to be met.

Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept of ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same as discussed under indicator 1.3.

Indicator 1.6 Employment retention: Eighty-five percent of individuals obtaining competitive employment will maintain employment and earnings 12 months after closure.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of consumers in the VR longitudinal study sample obtaining competitive employment who maintain employment and earnings 12 months after closure	**Status:** FY 1999 target was exceeded.	**Source:** VR Longitudinal Study for 1996-1999. The Department is in the process of developing a standard annual data collection mechanism for this indicator that will include data from all State VR agencies. Future data will be available in 2001. *Frequency:* Future data will be provided annually. *Next Update:* December 31, 2001

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996-1997:	85%	
1998-1999:	**86%**	**85%**
1999-2000:		85%
2000-2001:		85%

Explanation: Actual performance data cover an 18-24 month period. We expect future performance to be at the 85% level. However, the Longitudinal Study of the VR Program is ending and we will not have a new data source until FY 2001.

Validation Procedure: Rigorous data collection design was developed by contractor and approved by OMB. Several quality control mechanisms are in place.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The longitudinal study sample is nationally representative, but it does not include all VR consumers. The Longitudinal study was not designed to provide fiscal year cohorts.

Indicator 1.7 Satisfaction with employment: At least 75% percent of VR consumers will report they are satisfied with their employment outcome.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of consumers in the VR longitudinal study sample who reported they were very or mostly satisfied with their employment outcome			**Status:** No 1999 data, but FY 1997-1998 performance exceeded the 1999 target. **Explanation:** Actual performance data cover an 18-24 month period. We expect future performance to be at least at the 75% level. However, the Longitudinal Study of the VR Program is ending and we will not have a new data source until FY 2001.	**Source:** VR Longitudinal Study for 1995-1998. The Department is in the process of developing a standard data collection mechanism for this indicator that will include data from all State VR agencies. Future data will be available in 2001. *Frequency:* Future data will be provided annually. *Next Update:* December 31, 2001 **Validation Procedure:** Rigorous data collection design was developed by contractor and approved by OMB. Several quality control mechanisms are in place. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The longitudinal study sample is nationally representative, but it does not include all VR consumers. The Longitudinal study was not designed to provide fiscal year cohorts.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996:	72%			
1998	76%			
1999:	**No data available**	**At least 75%**		
2000:		At least 75%		
2001:		At least 75%		

OBJECTIVE 2: RSA WILL HELP STATES IMPROVE SERVICES AND OUTCOMES FOR CONSUMERS.

Indicator 2.1 Availability and use of data: The time required by RSA to produce an accessible national database will decrease until it reaches 6 months after the close of the fiscal year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of months after the close of the fiscal year at which time the database was available			**Status**: Positive movement toward target. **Explanation**: Implementation of the VR standards and indicators required by Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act will provide an incentive for states to report data in a timely manner.	**Source:** RSA Central Office records, 1998. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* September 2000 **Validation Procedure:** Reviewed by Department staff. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	14.5			
1998:	14			
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		9 months		
2001:		6 months		

452

453

OBJECTIVE 3: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS WITH THE MOST SIGNIFICANT DISABILITIES WHO HAVE RECEIVED SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT SERVICES BUT ACHIEVE COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES.

Indicator 3.1 Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal achieving competitive employment: the percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome (including supported employment outcomes in which the individual receives the minimum wage or better) will continue to increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieved a competitive employment outcome

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	69.6% (14,605)*	
1998:	69.1% (16,113)*	
1999:	**No data available**	**71.0%**
2000:		71.5%
2001:		71.7%

* Note: The number in parenthesis indicates the actual number of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieved a competitive employment outcome.

Assessment of Progress

Status: The 1999 data are expected to be available by September 2000. We expect the data to show that progress toward the target has been made.

Explanation: The 1998 data show a small decline in the percentage; however, the actual numbers increased. In September 1997, the Federal minimum wage increased from $4.75 to $5.15. Because, under this program, individuals must be earning at least the minimum wage to, in part, meet the criteria for competitive employment, the change in the minimum wage has affected performance on this indicator.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) State data from the R-911.
Frequency: Annually
Next Update: September 2000

Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept of ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same as discussed under indicator 1.3.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies continued from 1999

To assist in the achievement of performance targets established for indicators under objectives 1 and 3, the Rehabilitation Service Administration will:

- Develop a monitoring and technical assistance plan for State VR agencies that addresses performance on program outcome measures.
- Identify and disseminate information regarding effective practices for assisting individuals with disabilities to achieve appropriate employment outcomes and provide training as needed.
- Review, revise, and improve the issuance of RSA's policy and guidance directives to State VR agencies.
- Ensure that RSA staff is trained and able to effectively monitor state performance and provide technical assistance.
- Develop coordinated approaches among federal agencies (e.g., the Departments of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services and the Social Security Administration) that affect employment of individuals with disabilities.

New or Strengthened Strategies

To assist in the achievement of performance targets established for indicators under objectives 1 and 3, the Rehabilitation Service Administration will:

- Beginning in fiscal year 2001, develop State VR agency performance improvement plans with state agencies that are performing below standards established under Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act.
- Encourage State agencies to coordinate planning and service delivery with partners in the Workforce Investment System in order to improve vocational rehabilitation program outcomes.
- To decrease the time required by RSA to produce an accessible data base (objective 2), the Department will publish regulations on program standards and indicators that include consequences for not submitting the data needed to assess performance in a timely manner.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To increase the employment retention and earnings of consumers and also increase their occupational skill attainment, RSA will coordinate with its partners under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998, especially the Department of Labor, in conducting workforce activities through statewide and local systems. The VR program is a mandatory partner in the one-stop delivery system under Title I of WIA.
- In facilitate a seamless passage from school to work, RSA and the Office of Special Education Programs will coordinate transition services and activities for students with disabilities.
- To increase competitive employment outcomes for individuals with significant disabilities, RSA will coordinate with the Social Security Administration in implementing the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Numerous work disincentives exist, on the Federal, State and local levels, that discourage individuals with significant disabilities from seeking and maintaining employment.
- Despite the advances brought about by the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act, many employers remain reluctant to hire individuals with disabilities.
- Cost of providing VR services has increased as a result of serving increased numbers of individuals with significant disabilities whose rehabilitation is more costly.
- Minimal increases in program funding above the cost of living.
- Limited personnel and travel resources for effective program monitoring.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From two years old Annual plan (FY 1999)

Adjusted – None.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 4.2 were dropped.
- Objective 2 and its indicators were dropped.

From last year's Annual Plan (FY 2000)

Adjusted

- The FY 2000 performance target for indicator 1.2 was raised from 61% to 62.7%, based on actual 1998 performance.
- In indicator 1.3, the FY 1999 and FY 2000 performance targets for individuals with significant disabilities were raised (from 65.5 percent to 80.0 percent for 1999 and from 66% to 80.5% for 2000) because initial targets were set at a low level based on an error in the 1997 data.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1 on satisfaction with services has been dropped because the longitudinal study does not provide data for 1999. We will consider adding it again after a standard mechanism for data collection is developed.
- The indicator 2.2 on basic RSA monitoring has been dropped because full compliance is a statutory requirement.
- The indicator 2.3 on conducting comprehensive review has been dropped because RSA is changing its monitoring system.

New – None.

AMERICAN INDIAN VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

Goal: To improve employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations by providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation services.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 (lifelong learning) ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

FY 2000—$23,390,000

FY 2001—$23,998,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT ELIGIBLE AMERICAN INDIANS WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES AND ACHIEVE EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES CONSISTENT WITH THEIR PARTICULAR STRENGTHS, RESOURCES, ABILITIES, CAPABILITIES, AND INTERESTS.

Indicator 1.1 Number of eligible individuals who receive services under the program: The number of American Indians with disabilities who receive services under the American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services program will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of individuals who received vocational rehabilitation services under an individualized plan for employment			**Status:** Target for number of individuals receiving services was not met in FY 1999.	**Source:** Annual performance reports and project follow-up. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 31, 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** The Department has made a significant effort to provide technical assistance to current and potential grantees in order to increase the number and quality of American Indian vocational rehabilitation projects. The number of projects in full operation increased in FYs 1997, 1998, and 1999 (34, 37, and 47 respectively).	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by project grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
1997:	2,617 (34)*			
1998:	3,243 (37)*			
1999:	**3,186 (47)***	**3,750 (47)***		
2000:		3,730 (53)*		
2001:		4,350 (67)*		
**The number of projects that were in operation during the performance year.*			Although data show that the number of individuals receiving services has increased compared to the 1997 baselines, actual performance on this indicator was below the previously established 1999 target. The 1999 targets were set with data from only 2 years of past performance. One very large project appears to have had an exceptionally high performing year in 1998. Projections did not adequately take into account the length of time it takes first-year projects to become fully operational. Targets for FYs 2000 and 2001 have been modified to address these factors.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported and not standardized. Prior to the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998, the Department did not have clear authority to collect routine performance data and very limited information was available on the operation and performance of these projects. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) is working toward standardizing data collection and reporting for this program. The first comprehensive evaluation of the American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services program was initiated in 1999 under section 14 of the Rehabilitation Act. Information obtained from this study should also be useful in assessing performance and in developing future performance measures.

Indicator 1.2 Number of eligible individuals who achieve employment outcomes: The total number of American Indians with disabilities who exit the program after receiving vocational rehabilitation services under an individualized plan for employment and achieve an employment outcome will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

The number of individuals who achieved an employed outcome

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	530 (34)*	
1998:	598 (39)*	
1999:	**678 (47)***	**715 (47)***
2000:		765 (53)*
2001:		930 (67)*

**The number of projects that were in operation during the performance year.*

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target not met but positive movement toward the target.

Explanation: RSA has increased its monitoring and technical assistance efforts. Over time, existing projects are developing more expertise in operating effective projects and there has been an increase in communication between the tribal projects. The number of individuals achieving employment outcomes increased in FYs 1997, 1998, and 1999.

Although data show that the number of individuals achieving employment outcomes has increased compared to the 1997 baseline, actual performance on this indicator was below the previously established 1999 target. This is primarily due to the fact that the 1999 targets were set with very limited information on past performance and did not adequately take into account the length of time it takes first-year projects to become fully operational. Targets for FYs 2000 and 2001 have been modified to address this fact.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Annual performance reports and project followup.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: December 31, 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by project grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same limitations as reported under Indicator 1.1. In addition, there are inconsistencies in the interpretation of data element definitions and variations in case management practices across projects. As stated under Indicator 1.1, RSA is working toward standardizing data collection and reporting for this program.

Indicator 1.3 Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes: By the end of FY 2001, at least 61 percent of all eligible individuals who exit the program after receiving services under an individualized plan for employment will achieve an employment outcome.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage obtaining employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	No data available	
1998:	57%	
1999:	**61%**	**No target set**
2000:		61%
2001:		61%

Assessment of Progress

Status: No target set for 1999, however the data show an increase from FY 1998 to 1999.

Explanation: A performance target was not set for FY 1999 because baseline data on the number of persons exiting the program were not available when FY 1999 targets were established. Actual performance has improved because the number of individuals achieving employment outcomes increased in FYs 1998 and 1999 at a higher rate than the total number exiting the program.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Annual performance reports and project follow-up.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: December 31, 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by project grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same limitations as reported under Indicator 1.1. In addition, there are inconsistencies in the interpretation of data element definitions and variations in case management practices across projects. As stated under Indicator 1.1, RSA is working toward standardizing data collection and reporting for this program.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To increase the number of eligible individuals who receive services under the American Indian vocational rehabilitation (VR) services program by increasing the number of quality applications for American Indian VR services projects through linkage with capacity-building activities conducted by the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation (funded by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, or NIDRR) and capacity-building grantees funded under Section 21 of the Act.
- To increase the number and percentage of eligible individuals who achieve employment outcomes under the American Indian VR services program, RSA is conducting the first program evaluation study of multiple projects. The study will identify best practice information and recommend strategies for improved program management and service delivery.

New or Strengthened Strategies

To increase the number and percentage of eligible individuals who achieve employment outcomes under the American Indian vocational rehabilitation services program, the Rehabilitation Services Administration will:

- Monitor and provide technical assistance to projects in order to increase program effectiveness and project management.
- Work collaboratively with the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on American Indian VR to provide training and technical assistance on effective program management to American Indian vocational rehabilitation project staff.
- Conduct annual training conferences for all rehabilitation professionals participating and interested in American Indian VR services.
- Continue to work closely with the Consortia of Administrators of Native American Rehabilitation to promote high-quality American Indian VR services programs.
- Disseminate promising practices from relevant projects funded under the Demonstration and Training Program to the American Indian VR services grantees.
- Work toward building a network of higher education institutions that can deliver training to American Indian VR project staff through distance education strategies for undergraduate and graduate credit towards degrees in vocational rehabilitation. The network would include existing institutions that provide rehabilitation counselor training programs and existing Indian colleges.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Coordinate with the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on American Indian VR (funded by NIDRR) in providing technical assistance and training to American Indian VR services project staff.
- Promote coordination and collaboration between American Indian VR services projects and the relevant state VR agency.
- Coordination with the Bureau of Indian Affairs on state action plans.
- Program/grant information is shared with the Administration for Native Americans within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Project proposals and on-site visits to grantees identify the following significant challenges to increasing the employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations and providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation services include lack of transportation, experienced project staff, and specialized rehabilitation providers; geographic isolation and cultural differences; and the limited availability of employment opportunities on or near the reservation.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

- Targets 1.1 and 1.2 were modified to account for the length of time it takes new projects to become operational under this program.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (CAP)

Goal: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports the goals of the Strategic Plan by protecting the civil rights of individuals with disabilities who are seeking to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power.
FY 2000—$10,928,000
FY 2001—$11,147,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (CAPS) MEET EXPECTATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS SERVED IN TERMS OF THEIR SATISFACTION WITH THE CAP SERVICES RECEIVED.

Indicator 1.1 Satisfied CAP clients: The number of CAPs achieving or exceeding a client satisfaction rate of 87 percent will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of CAPs that achieve or exceed a client satisfaction rate of 87 percent			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** CAP FY 1998 performance report, RSA-227 uniform data collection. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* April 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	34 (60% of CAPs)		**Explanation:** The baseline will be established using the final FY 1999 data, available in April 2000. FY 1998 was the first time the CAP programs used the recently revised reporting instrument. We want to collect one more year of data before establishing any baselines for this program.	**Validation Procedure:** Appropriate review of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. On-site compliance reviews are conducted and random sampling of on-site files are cross-checked with reported data for verification.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Meet or exceed the prior year		
2001:		Meet or exceed the prior year		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data collection instrument (RSA-227) was recently revised and approved by OMB to require uniform reporting definitions and numerical data collection. No known limitations at this time; however, self-reporting by grantees may pose some limitation.

OBJECTIVE 2: RESOLVE CASES AT LOWEST POSSIBLE LEVEL.

Indicator 2.1 Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): The percentage of cases resolved through the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of cases resolved through ADR will increase			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** CAP FY 1998 performance report, RSA-227 uniform data collection. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* April 2000.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998:	4,388 (44.3 %)		**Explanation:** The target for the percentage of cases resolved using ADR will be established using the final FY 1999 data, available in April 2000. See complete explanation at 1.1.	**Validation Procedure:** Same as 1.1.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Increase over prior year		
2001:		Increase over prior year		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as 1.1.

OBJECTIVE 3: ACCURATELY IDENTIFY PROBLEM AREAS REQUIRING SYSTEMIC CHANGE AND ENGAGE IN SYSTEMIC ACTIVITY TO IMPROVE SERVICES UNDER THE REHABILITATION ACT.

Indicator 3.1 Effects of systemic change: The percentage of CAPs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will achieve or exceed baseline.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of CAPs reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The target for the percentage of CAPs reporting on their changes to policies and practices will be established using the final FY 1999 data, available in April 2000. See 1.1 for complete explanation.	**Source:** CAP FY 1998 performance report, RSA-227, narrative section. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* April 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Same as 1.1. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data will be limited because it is self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted are reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	50.9%			
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Increase over prior year		
2001:		Increase over prior year		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Inform National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems (NAPAS) of ED activities in this area at monthly meetings.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Provide technical assistance on how CAPs should approach each case in a comprehensive manner.
- Provide technical assistance to CAPs on the use of the model client satisfaction survey.
- Provide technical assistance to encourage CAPs to follow up with individuals served.
- Develop a model ADR policy for the CAPs.
- Provide technical assistance on how CAPs can use ADR effectively.
- Compile and assess CAP narrative reporting regarding systemic activities in order to provide technical assistance and followup for those CAPs not reporting systemic activities.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- This program coordinates with other protection and advocacy programs administered by HHS through monthly interagency meetings. The primary Federal partners at these meetings are RSA, the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD), and the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS). The National Institute on Disability Research and Rehabilitation (NIDRR) also participates in these meetings. The purpose of these meetings is for the Federal partners to ensure that these programs receive sufficient training and technical assistance, funded by all of the partners, so that the programs can provide quality advocacy services to individuals with disabilities. The Federal partners also discuss potential compliance issues that might be arising with a grantee.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- As the number of individuals with disabilities within the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program increase, the types of services available to them change, and the methods of rehabilitation expand, CAPs are challenged to maintain their services that protect the rights of all individuals seeking or receiving vocational rehabilitation services.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- The objectives were reordered.
- Objective 4, which measured the number of CAPs that report on their systemic advocacy activities, was adjusted. In FY 1998, the first year of data collection, 96.4 percent of CAPs reported on this item. The issue of under-reporting did not present a problem.

Dropped

- Objective 1, along with Indicator 1.1, that measured the number of CAPs reporting multiple individual case files, was dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was adjusted to measure the number of CAPs that achieve or exceed a client satisfaction baseline of 87 percent.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1.
- Indicator 3.1.

New—None.

TRAINING PROGRAM

Goal: To provide the public vocational rehabilitation (VR) sector with well-trained staff and to maintain and upgrade the skills of current staff.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support Objective 4.1 (customer service). Providing the VR program with skilled practitioners and improving the skills and ability of current practitioners leads to improved outcomes for people with disabilities in the VR system. These objectives also support Objective 3.2 of ED's Strategic Plan (financial aid and services to help postsecondary students enroll and complete their educational program) as 75 percent of funds from long-term training grant must be used for scholarship assistance.

FY 2000—$39,629,000

FY 2001—$39,629,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: TO PRODUCE GRADUATES WHO WORK WITHIN THE VR SYSTEM TO HELP INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES ACHIEVE THEIR GOALS.

Indicator 1.1 Numbers trained: The number of students supported by RSA scholarships and the number of RSA scholars graduating will remain stable per constant $1 million invested.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Scholars supported			**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Annual grantee reporting form. Baseline data collected for academic year 1997-1998.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1997-98:	1,600		**Explanation:** To date, we have baseline data only. 1998-1999 data are reported in January 2000, and will be available in April 2000.	*Next Update:* June 2000.
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
1999-00:		1,473		
2000-01:		1,391		
Scholars supported per $1 million				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined.
1997-98:	101			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
1999-00:		101		
2000-01:		101		
Scholars graduating				
1997-98:	800			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
1999-00:		729		
2000-01:		688		
Scholars graduating per $1 million				
1997-98:	50			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
1999-00:		50		
2000-01:		50		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Investment				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997-98:	$15.835 M			
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
1999-00:		$15.265M ($14.585)*		
2000-01:		$15.205M ($13.771)*		
* In constant dollars				

Indicator 1.2 Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Annual grantee reporting form. Baseline data collected for academic year 1997-98.
1997-98:	87%			*Frequency:* Annually.
1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**	**Explanation:** To date, we have baseline data only. 1998-99 data are reported in January 2000 and will be available in April 2000.	*Next Update:* June 2000.
2000:		89%		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
2001:		90%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined.

OBJECTIVE 2: MAINTAIN AND UPGRADE THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS OF PERSONNEL CURRENTLY EMPLOYED IN THE PUBLIC VR SYSTEM.

Indicator 2.1 Qualified personnel: The percent of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standard will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Evaluation.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		*Frequency:* Once, begins late FY 2000.
FY 2000:		N/A	**Explanation:** In FY 2000, RSA is conducting an evaluation of the Training program that will collect data on each state's CSPD current standard and the number of staff that meet that standard. Many external factors could affect the ongoing collection of data for indicator.	*Next Update:* Unknown.
FY 2001:		N/A		Future source: Ongoing collection could be through the In-Service Training program's annual performance report.
				Validation Procedure: Data would be supplied through external RSA contractor. No formal verification procedure applied.
				Limitations of Data and Planned improvement: Numerous external factors may pose limits to current collection and ongoing collection. Future data source, In-Service Program's annual performance report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Provide grantees with clearer guidance through annual training conference, Project Director orientations, and Project Director letters on the purpose of the ED program and ways to respond better to program goals.
- In FY 1999, RSA began an initiative designed to assist states in the implementation of their Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) (currently 16 Long-Term Training Program grants supported).

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Task order of Regional Continuing Education Programs and In-service Training programs began in October 1998.
- Planned FY 2000 Evaluation of Training program.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The purpose of this program is to provide the VR state grant program with qualified professional staff.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The reporting system has been revised; we will analyze its usefulness with the 1997-98 academic year data reported in January 2000 and available in April 2000.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- The percentage working has been modified by adding the words "through acceptable employment" for clarification purposes.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

DEMONSTRATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Goal: To expand, improve, or further the purposes of activities authorized under the Act.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives and strategies are linked to Strategic Goal 3.4 (lifelong learning) so that adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.
FY 2000—$21,672,000
FY 2001—$21,672,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: EXPAND AND IMPROVE THE PROVISION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES THAT LEAD TO EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES.

Indicator 1.1 Expansion: Eighty percent of projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies or yielded results that can contribute to the expansion of services for or the employment of individuals with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** Final reports, which will be reviewed by external peer review panels.
1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:		N/A	**Explanation:** RSA, through an external contractor, is currently working to develop a uniform data collection instrument for use by these grantees.	*Next Update:* Final reports, submitted in FY 2000.
2001:		N/A		**Validation Procedure:** No data to validate.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: N/A.

Indicator 1.2 Impact: The percentage of projects reporting an impact on rehabilitation service providers including state VR agencies, community rehabilitation service providers, and other providers of rehabilitation services will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** FY 1999 task order will develop and field test a uniform data collection instrument. Findings will be used to establish baseline.
1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		*Frequency:* Annually, once in use.
2000:		Continuous increase	**Explanation:** RSA, through an external contractor, is currently working to develop a uniform data collection instrument for use by these grantees.	*Next Update:* FY 2001.
2001:		Continuous increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Grantees may have difficulty in reporting on their impact to an external agency. Numerous external factors may change the provision or methods of rehabilitation services, and grantees may not be able to pinpoint their impact in the process.

OBJECTIVE 2: DISSEMINATE INFORMATION ABOUT SUCCESSFUL NEW TYPES OR PATTERNS OF SERVICES OR DEVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES AND REPORT THE IMPACT OF THE PROJECTS.

Indicator 2.1 Dissemination: The percentage of funded projects that disseminate information to state VR agencies and other funded projects and disability-related organizations will increase and the number of presentations will increase.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Grantees				**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** RSA, through an external contractor, is currently working to develop a uniform data collection instrument for use by these grantees.	**Source:** FY 1999 task order will develop and field test a uniform data collection instrument. Findings will be used to establish baseline. *Frequency:* Annually, once in use. *Next Update:* FY 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** RSA, through an external contractor, is currently working to develop a uniform data collection instrument for use by these grantees. Grantees and their activities are extremely diverse. Uniform data collection will be a great improvement over the current method of grantee self-reporting.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Grantees	**Presentations**			
1998:	42	1,131			
1999:	**Data not available**		**No specific target set**		
2000:			Continuous increase		
2001:			Continuous increase		
Presentations					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
1998:	1,131				
1999:	**Data not available**		**No specific target set**		
2000:			Continuous increase		
2001:			Continuous increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) will contract with an outside contractor to evaluate grantee best practices and develop a uniform data collection instrument.
- RSA will provide technical assistance to all grantees in order to promote successful outcomes. Interaction with state VR will be emphasized.
- Informational memos will identify and disseminate information to other grantees and state VR agencies regarding best practices.
- RSA will continue to convene annual project directors' meetings to disseminate information.
- RSA will use print and electronic media to disseminate information, including project directors' reports and presentation, and the contract findings (e.g., Manual of Project Director's meeting and Web sites of RSA and funded projects).

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Sponsors Interagency Group including Social Security, Department of Labor, Health of Human Services (TANF, HCFA, ADD, and SMHA).
- Received Interagency funding from Department of Labor for System Change projects.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Preparing a uniform data collection instrument to reflect diverse projects and activities – Reauthorization gives specific authority to collect data. Regulations for the program are not yet finished.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicators have been reordered but have remained largely the same.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicators have been reordered but have remained largely the same.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS PROGRAM

Goal: To increase employment opportunities for migrant and seasonal farmworkers who have disabilities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support the Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 (ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunities to increase earning power over their lifetime).

FY 2000—$2,350,000

FY 2001—$2,850,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT ELIGIBLE MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (VR) SERVICES AND ACHIEVE EMPLOYMENT.

Indicator 1.1 Numbers served: The overall number of migrant and seasonal farmworkers with disabilities who receive services each year will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No FY 1999 data yet.	**Source:** FY 1998 data collected from grantees' final performance reports. Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) state data from the R-911 and grantee project performance reports.
FY 1998:	9,200*		**Explanation:** Migrant and Seasonal farmworkers are served through both the Vocational Rehabilitation State grants program and through projects supported by this program. Actual 1998 data shown were obtained through grantee project performance reports and do not include those individuals served solely through the VR State grant program. Future data will be uniformly collected through the R-911 report and will be used to establish baseline. FY 2001 will be the first year of collection on this element.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2001.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		**Validation Procedure:** The R-911 is verified by the ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data. Grantee performance reports have no formal verification procedure applied.
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Inconsistent state Vocational Rehabilitation agency reporting. To ensure consistency across states, Rehabilitation Services Agency has modified this reporting element to clarify that states must report on all migrant and seasonal farmworkers served through either program.
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		

* Data from the 14 projects indicate that more than 9,200 migrant and seasonal farmworkers were served through direct and outreach services.

Indicator 1.2 Individuals who achieve employment outcomes: The overall percentage of migrant or seasonal farmworkers with disabilities served who achieve employment outcomes each year will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No uniform 1999 data.	**Source:** Rehabilitation Services Agency state data from the R-911 and grantee performance reports.
FY 1996:	1,073*	No target set	**Explanation:** Actual 1996 data shown were obtained through R-911 before changes were made on the R-911 and may include some individuals served through projects. Future data will be uniformly collected through the R-911	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2001.
FY 1999:	**Not available**	**Continuing increase**		**Validation Procedure:** The R-911 is verified by the ED attestation process and ED Standards for
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		

* Based on inconsistent data from R-911 for the number of migrant and seasonal farmworkers achieving employment.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	report and will be used to establish baseline. FY 2001 will be the first year of collection on this element.	Evaluating Program Performance Data. Grantee performance reports have no formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Inconsistent state VR agency reporting on this element. To ensure consistency across states, RSA has modified this reporting element to clarify that states must report on all migrant and seasonal farmworkers served through either program.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Continuous guidance to grantees on the purpose of ED program and ways to respond better to program goals. Ongoing technical assistance is provided to grantees who demonstrate difficulty or noncompliance with program standards.
- Coordinate grantee activities with the state Vocational Rehabilitation agency. Through national conference and other means, opportunities are provided for exemplary migrant projects to share information on methods and models for building strong partnerships with state Vocational Rehabilitation and other migrant programs.
- Conduct telephone monitoring to all continuing projects to assess program activities and provide technical assistance.
- Conduct an internal review of performance reports to determine the effectiveness of the program in meeting its stated objectives. Working with other Federal offices within and outside the Department, Regional Services Administration will identify and provide opportunities for grantees to identify and exchange information addressing work disincentives affecting unemployed migrant workers with disabilities.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) has created an OSERS-wide Migrant Workgroup that include representatives from OSERS' three components (Regional Services Administration, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), Office of Special Education Programs(OSEP)) and a representative from the Office of Assistant Secretary. The goal is to identify anJ develop resolutions to issues impacting migrant and seasonal farmworkers.
- The Office of Rehabilitative Services Administration is a member of the Migrant Interagency Committee. The purpose of the Committee is to discuss and coordinate issues relevant to migrant and seasonal farmworkers. The Committee members include representatives from Federal agencies (Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Department of Energy, Department of Agricultural, Census Bureau) and other related organizations. The Committee meets quarterly.
- Rehabilitation Services Administration has contracted with Research Triangle Institute, Center for Research in Education, North Carolina, (1) to describe the agency's implementation of GPRA performance indicators in 10 programs and the current data collection and analysis systems and (2) to assess the need for improved project management tools to facilitate full implementation of GPRA.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To identify issues concerning migrant and seasonal farmworkers. RSA's Program Manager for the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program has Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services representatives on the Migrant Interagency Committee which includes representatives from other Federal agencies such as Department of Labor, HHS, Department of Agricultural, Census Bureau, and Departmental Regional Offices to ensure that proper and timely services are being provided to migrant and seasonal farmworkers. Meetings with these other Federal agencies are held to collect information and discuss issues regarding migrant and seasonal farmworkers. National conferences are sponsored by different agencies, and activities are coordinated between the various agencies to ensure information is disseminated regarding migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- High mobility of migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Objective 2 and its indicator were retained as internal measures.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

RECREATIONAL PROGRAM

Goal: To provide to individuals with disabilities recreation activities and related experiences that can be expected to aid in their employment, mobility, socialization, independence, and community integration.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support the Strategic Goal 3.4 (ensuring access to services that provide individuals with disabilities the opportunity to increase their learning experiences over their lifetime).
FY 2000—$3,521,000
FY 2001—$2,596,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS ARE SUSTAINED AFTER FEDERAL FUNDING CEASES.

Indicator 1.1 Project continuation: Recreational programs are sustained after Federal funding ceases. By fall 2000, 86 percent of programs initiated since FY 1993 will be continuing after Federal funding has ended.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** Quarterly telephone monitoring reports and Annual and Final Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000.
1998:	79%			
1999:	**No data available**	**83%**	**Explanation:** On average, projects have had a success rate of sustaining projects after Federal funding ceases.	
2000:		86%		
2001:		86%		**Validation Procedure:** Data collected from reports compared to proposed plans in original application.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Program staff will contact each project to ensure that projects are continuing. Each project will provide specific information (location, number served, types of disabilities). An automated database will be developed to track and maintain contact with projects after Federal funding ceases.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

To address issues relative to the Recreational Program, the Office of Rehabilitation Services Administration will implement the following strategies--

- Provide continuous guidance to grantees on the purpose of the program and better ways to respond to program goals.
- Through national conferences and other means, Rehabilitation Services Administration will provide opportunities for exemplary recreation projects to share information on methods and models for building strong partnerships with other recreational providers and with state Vocational Rehabilitation agencies. Grantees will have an opportunity to present their programs and receive technical assistance from Rehabilitation Services Agency.
- Conduct quarterly telephone monitoring of all continuing projects to provide guidance and to determine whether the project will continue after Federal funding ceases.
- Work with other Federal offices (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Labor, and Department of Education's 10 Regional Offices within and outside the Department) to coordinate activities and provide information regarding recreational services/programs for individuals with disabilities.
- Contact annually all projects whose Federal funds just ended to determine whether the project is being sustained without Federal support.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- The Office of Rehabilitation Services Administration has contracted with Research Triangle Institute, Center for Research in Education, North Carolina, to (1) describe the agency's implementation of GPRA performance indicators in 10 programs and the current data collection and analysis systems and (2) assess the need for improved project management tools to facilitate full implementation of GPRA.
- RSA plans to provide this program's GPRA plan to applicant for their information and use.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To ensure that recreational services and issues are identified for individuals with disabilities, the Office of Rehabilitation Services Administration will coordinate with the Department's 10 Federal Regional Offices to identify issues within the state regarding recreational services to individuals with disabilities. Specific solutions to address these issues will be identified. Regional Office staff will be asked to participate in activities regarding the Recreational Program (e.g., attending meetings, teleconferences, reviewing new grant applications). Other Federal agencies with recreational programs will be identified for coordination of activities.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Project continuation will depend on individual project's ability to obtain non-Federal funding to sustain projects. Building community support for financial commitment to the project.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Old Objective 2, recreational programs will maintain the same level of services over the 3-year period, along with Its indicator 2.1 (individuals served), was dropped. The objective that recreational programs are sustained after Federal funding ceases is more appropriate for this program.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Objective 2, ensure that recreational programs will maintain the same level of services, along with its Indicator 2.1 (individuals served), was dropped. The objective that recreational programs are sustained after Federal funding ceases is more appropriate for this program.

New—None.

PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS (PAIR)

Goal: To provide assistance and information to individuals with disabilities eligible for the Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) program and conduct advocacy to ensure the protection of their rights under Federal law.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports the goals of the Strategic Plan by protecting the civil rights of individuals with disabilities who are seeking to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power.

FY 2000—$11,894,000

FY 2001—$12,132,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ADEQUATELY IDENTIFY PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES SO THAT PAIR PROGRAMS MEET THE NEEDS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

Indicator 1.1 Percentage of requests for service outside PAIR priorities: The percentage of individuals seeking services whose concerns are not within the PAIR's stated priorities will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available. Data will not be available until 2001.	**Source:** PAIR performance reports *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* April 2001.
1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
2000:		No specific target set	**Explanation:** Uniform data collection instrument was approved by OMB in January 2000. FY 2000 will be the first year of collection. These data will be available in 2001.	**Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied through uniform data reporting. Once data are submitted, appropriate review will be conducted by program specialists.
2001:		No specific target set		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The collection instrument does not contain known data limitations.

OBJECTIVE 2: PAIR PROGRAMS MEET EXPECTATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS SERVED IN TERMS OF THEIR SATISFACTION WITH THE PAIR SERVICES RECEIVED.

Indicator 2.1 Survey responses: The percentage of PAIR programs achieving or exceeding the client satisfaction baseline will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available. Data will not be available until 2001.	**Source:** PAIR performance reports *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* April 2001.
1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
2000:		No specific target set	**Explanation:** FY 2000 will be the first year of collection. A client satisfaction baseline along with the targets for the percentage of PAIRs that meet or exceed the baseline will be established once data are available.	**Validation Procedure:** Same as 1.1.
2001:		No specific target set		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as 1.1.

OBJECTIVE 3: IDENTIFY PROBLEM AREAS REQUIRING SYSTEMIC CHANGE AND ENGAGE IN SYSTEMIC ACTIVITIES TO ADDRESS THOSE PROBLEMS.

Indicator 3.1 Policy changes: The percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available. Data will not be available until 2001.	**Source:** PAIR performance reports *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* April 2001.
1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
2000:		No specific target set	**Explanation:** FY 2000 will be the first year of collection. Baseline data in FY 2001.	**Validation Procedure:** Same as 1.1.
2001:		No specific target set		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data will be limited because it will be self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted will be reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Consult with Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights grantees, the National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems (NAPAS), and others on the development of key data collection elements.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Assess findings from the Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights program evaluation to identify additional measures for this program.
- Provide technical assistance to help Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights programs identify appropriate priorities and objectives.
- Develop a model client satisfaction survey for Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights programs to use.
- Provide technical assistance to encourage Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights programs to follow up with individuals served.
- Compile and assess Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights narrative reporting.
- Provide technical assistance and followup for those Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights programs not reporting systemic advocacy activities.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- This program coordinates with other protection and advocacy programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) through monthly interagency meetings. The partners in this interagency agreement are RSA, the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD), and the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS). The Department of Education's National Institute on Disability Research & Rehabilitation (NIDRR) also participates in these meetings. During these meetings, the three primary Federal partners (RSA, ADD, and CMHS) work to ensure that the protection and advocacy programs receive the training and technical assistance they need to provide quality advocacy services to individuals with disabilities. We pool our training and technical assistance funds into an interagency agreement. These funds are put into a contract that has been awarded, after a competition, to the National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems (NAPAS). The Federal partners work closely with the National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems to identify training needs for the programs as well as participate as training presenters throughout the year. Finally, during these meetings, the Federal partners discuss potential compliance issues that have arisen with our grantees.
- RSA also coordinates our activities with the Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights grantees themselves. Whenever RSA plans to undertake a new initiative, we seek input from the grantees. The most recent example of this was the Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights annual program performance report, which was recently approved by the Office of Management and Budget.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Objective 1, for RSA to develop a data collection instrument, was dropped. There is no need to retain such an administrative indicator. This instrument was recently approved for use by grantees in FY 2000.
- Indicator 2.2, which asked for Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights to assess the appropriateness of their priorities and objectives and make changes as necessary, was dropped. This indicator is reflected in this year's Indicator 1.1.

Dropped

- Indicator 3.1, which measured the response rate of a client's surveys, was dropped. We do not believe that the survey response rate will be low.
- Indicator 4.1, the percentage of Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights reporting on their systemic advocacy will increase, was dropped. A more appropriate measure is the percentage of PAIRS that report changes in policies and practices, which is retained in this year's Indicator 3.1.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

496

497

PROJECTS WITH INDUSTRY (PWI)

Goal: To facilitate the establishment of partnerships between rehabilitation service providers and business and industry in order to create and expand employment and career advancement opportunities for individuals with disabilities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

FY 2000--$22,071,000

FY 2001--$22,071,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT PWI SERVICES (THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS WITH BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY) RESULT IN COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT, INCREASED WAGES, AND JOB RETENTION FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

Indicator 1.1 Placement rate of individuals with disabilities into competitive employment: The percentage of individuals served who are placed in competitive employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of individuals served who were placed in competitive employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1997:	59% (11,300)*	
FY 1998:	49% (6,792)*	
FY 1999:	**59% (8,239)***	**61%**
FY 2000:		61%
FY 2001:		62%

* Note: The number in parentheses indicates the actual number of individuals served who were placed in competitive employment.

Assessment of Progress

Status: FY 1999 performance fell short of the 1999 target by 2 percent.

Explanation: Although the program fell short of its established FY 1999 performance target, FY 1999 performance was higher than performance for FY 1998. In FY 1998 and 1999, there were fewer grantees (104 and 101, respectively) as compared to in FY 1997 (119).

The percentage of persons served who are significantly disabled and the percentage of previously unemployed persons have increased. The projects serving these populations face greater challenges in obtaining competitive employment. The FY 2000 target has been adjusted to reflect gradual improvement in reaching the 62 percent target.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Grantee performance indicator data.
Frequency: Annually
Next Update: January 2001

Validation Procedure: The sources and data quality are validated by checking to see if the data is reasonable. On-site compliance reviews are also conducted of at least 15 percent of grant recipients annually to: (1) determine whether the grant is managed in accordance with Federal requirements; (2) identify areas where the project can be improved; and (3) assess the project's mission as it relates to the Department's mission.

Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements: The primary limitation of the data is that the data are self-reported. Technical assistance and regular monitoring is provided to grantees in order to receive updated reports from the grantee regarding progress towards meeting project goals.

Indicator 1.2 Change in earnings of individuals who are placed in competitive employment: Projects With Industry projects will report that participants placed in competitive employment increase earnings by an average of at least $218 per week.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average increase in weekly earnings			**Status:** FY 1999 performance exceeded the 1999 target by $17.	**Source:** Grantee performance indicator data. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* January 2001
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1997:	$207		**Explanation:** FY 1999 performance reflected an average increase in earnings of $226 per week. In FY 1999 there were fewer grantees (101) than in the baseline year of FY 1997 (119). On average, the FY 1999 group of grantees demonstrated higher performance on this indicator. However, we have only raised the FY 2000 and FY 2001 targets to $218 per week because of the variability in annual performance.	**Validation Procedure:** Same as indicator 1.1.
FY 1998:	$209			**Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as indicator 1.1. In addition, performance data on this indicator is further limited because the national average is calculated based on self-reported project averages.
FY 1999:	**$226**	**$209**		
FY 2000:		$218		
FY 2001:		$218		

OBJECTIVE 2: ENSURE THAT PWI SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH THE MOST NEED.

Indicator 2.1 Percentage of individuals served who were unemployed for 6 months or more prior to program entry who are placed in competitive employment: The percentage of previously unemployed individuals served who are placed into competitive employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of previously unemployed individuals served who were placed in competitive employment			**Status:** FY 1999 performance fell short of meeting the target by 4 percent. Despite declines in actual performance in 1998 and 1999 from the 1997 base year, progress toward the target is likely in 2000.	**Source:** Grantee performance indicator data. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* January 2001
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1997:	60%		**Explanation:** Although the FY 1999 target was not met, the overall number of previously unemployed persons who were placed in competitive employment increased as compared to FY 1998. In addition, both the number and percentage of persons served who were previously unemployed has increased. Projects serving this population face greater challenges in obtaining competitive employment.	**Validation Procedure:** Same as indicator 1.1.
FY 1998:	48%			**Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as indicator 1.1.
FY 1999:	**58%**	**62%**		
FY 2000:		60%		
FY 2001:		61%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies continued from 1999

- To address grantees' difficulty or noncompliance with the placement standards and the wage standard defined in Projects With Industry regulations, the program will provide ongoing technical assistance to grantees who demonstrate difficulty or noncompliance with these standards, including monitoring progress through off-site monitoring and progress reports.
- To address grantees' difficulty in developing partnerships with business and with State Vocational Rehabilitation agencies, the program will, through national conferences and other means, provide opportunities for exemplary Projects With Industry projects to share information on methods and models for building strong partnerships with industry, and with state Vocational Rehabilitation agencies. These efforts will include dissemination of information on effective Business Advisory Councils, including representatives from labor and from the disability community.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To address grantees' difficulty in placing previously unemployed individuals, the program will provide technical assistance to grantees that demonstrate poor performance in this regard.
- To address grantees' difficulty in placing previously unemployed individuals, the program will work with other federal offices within and outside the Department to provide opportunities for grantees to identify and exchange information addressing work disincentives affecting previously unemployed individuals with disabilities.
- To address grantees' difficulty or noncompliance in meeting the targets for placement rate and percentage of individuals served who were unemployed for 6 months or more prior to program entry who are placed in competitive employment, the program will monitor progress of grantees who demonstrating difficulty or noncompliance with these standards through off-site monitoring and progress reports.
- To identify strengths and weaknesses of the program and to better understand program performance, the Rehabilitation Services Administration is initiating an evaluation study of the Projects with Industry program in FY 2000.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To identify job and career availability within the community, Projects With Industry projects are required to coordinate with the local workforce investment board for the community under section 118(b)(1)(B) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.
- To increase coordination between the Projects With Industry program and the State Vocational Rehabilitation program, the project's Business Advisory Council must include a representative of the appropriate State Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Despite the advances brought about by the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act, developing partnerships with business still remains a challenge. Many employers remain reluctant to hire individuals with disabilities. Some employers are skeptical about their ability to do the job. Others persist in believing that hiring an individual with a disability is costly and a bad business risk.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From two years old Annual plan (FY 1999)

Adjusted – None.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.3. Job Retention, was dropped since the 1999 Plan. This indicator stated that "an indicator will be developed to assess the percentage of individuals who maintain employment nine months after employment." As a result of changes made by the 1998 Amendments to the Rehabilitation, the implementing regulations have been amended to require that projects report the number of individuals who are employed at 3 and 9 months after placement in competitive employment. Projects will begin reporting this data in FY 2000. After the Department establishes a performance baseline, an appropriate indicator will be established.

From last year's Annual Plan (FY 2000)

Adjusted

- The FY 2000 targets for indicators 1.1 and 2.1 were adjusted to reflect gradual improvement in reaching the FY2001 target.
- The FY 2000 and 2001 targets for indicator 1.2 have been raised to reflect increased performance in 1999.

Dropped – None.

New – None.

INDEPENDENT LIVING PROGRAMS

Goal: Individuals with significant disabilities served by the Title VII, Chapter 1, programs will achieve consumer-determined independent living goals, and Independent Living Services will be provided and activities will be conducted to improve or expand services to older individuals who are blind.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This program supports Objective 3.4 (lifelong learning).
FY 2000—$85,296,000
FY 2001—$95,296,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS WITH SIGNIFICANT DISABILITIES WHO ARE SERVED BY AND BENEFIT FROM THE TITLE VII, CHAPTER 1, PROGRAMS.

Indicator 1.1 Number of individuals with significant disabilities served grouped by age: The number of individuals who receive individual independent living services will increase in all age categories.

Targets and Performance Data

The number of individuals receiving individual independent living services in FY 199

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets
	Under 6	6-17	18-22	23-54	55-older	
1997:	1,544	5,831	10,529	77,362	44,245	
	Total: 160,000 *					
1998:	Total: Data not yet available					
1999:	**Total: Data not yet available**					**Total: 142,301**
2000:						Total: 146,486
2001:						Total: 149,277

***Note:** Additional 20,000 with ages unknown.

Assessment of Progress

Status: Progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: Data are gathered from over 425 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data base by a subcontractor.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) 704 reports (704 Report), annual, 1999.
Frequency: Annually
Next Update: February 2000

Validation Procedure: Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.

Indicator 1.2: Number of goals set and achieved by consumers: The number of consumer goals set and achieved will increase in all service areas measured.

Targets and Performance Data

The FY 1997 Goals	Actual Performance: Set	Met	Rate
Self-care:	44,120	28,503	64.6%
Communication:	19,055	12,884	67.6%
Mobility:	20,211	13,334	65.9%
Residential:	20,589	12,121	58.8%
Educational:	19,058	13,754	72.2%
Vocational:	13,990	7,100	50.8%
Other:	39,516	22,913	58.0%
Total:	**176,539**	**110,609**	**62.3%**

Assessment of Progress

Status: Progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: Data are gathered from over 425 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data base by a subcontractor.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: RSA 704 Report, 1998.
Frequency: Annually
Next Update: February 2000

Validation Procedure: Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	62.3% total			
1998:	Data not yet available			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**62.5% total**		
2000:		63% total		
2001:		63% total		
2002:		63% total		

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE SATISFACTION OF CONSUMERS WHO RECEIVE CHAPTER 1 INDEPENDENT LIVING (IL) SERVICES.

Indicator 2.1 Consumer satisfaction with IL services: A consistently high proportion of consumers will report satisfaction with IL services.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
FY 1997 New York State survey: Percentage of consumers who are very or mostly satisfied with services			**Status:** Progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** 704 Report and State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL), Attachment 16. Beginning in 1998.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Data are gathered from over 425 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data base by a subcontractor.	*Frequency:* Annually
1997:	85%			*Next Update:* February 2000
1998:	Data not yet available			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**No target set**		**Validation Procedure:** Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.
2000:		87%		
2001:		87%		
2002:		87%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.

OBJECTIVE 3: IMPROVE ACCESS TO PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES (PAS), HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY-BASED LIVING THROUGH INCREASED ADVOCACY EFFORTS.

Indicator 3.1: Number of Centers for Independent Living (CILs) using effective advocacy techniques: All CILs will have an advocacy program to address at least two of the following areas: (a) community-based personal assistance services (b), accessible/affordable housing (c), accessible/affordable transportation, and (d) options for moving people from nursing homes and other institutions to the community.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Preliminary results FY 1997, New York State: Percentage of CILs with programs in two areas			**Status:** Progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** RSA 704 Report, 1998.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Data are gathered from over 425 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data base by a subcontractor.	*Frequency:* Annually
1997:	25%			*Next Update:* February 2000
1998:	Data not yet available			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**30%**		**Validation Procedure:** Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.
2000:		50%		
2001:		80%		
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.

Indicator 3.2: Increased Community-based Living: The number of individuals who leave nursing homes and other institutions for community-based housing and the number of individuals at risk of entering nursing homes and other institutions who are receiving IL services and can remain at home will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Number of Individuals who Left Nursing Homes/Institutions		**Number of Individuals who Remained in the Community**		**Status:** Progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** RSA 704 Report, 1998.
Year	**Actual**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**	**Explanation:** Data are gathered from over 425 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data base by a subcontractor.	*Frequency:* Annually
1998:	800		8,000			*Next Update:* February 2000
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**No target set**	**Data not yet available**	**No target set**		**Validation Procedure:** Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.
2000:		850		8,500		
2001:		900		9,000		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.
2002:		950		9,500		
* As estimated by RSA staff interviews of CIL executive directors						

OBJECTIVE 4: INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF FUNDS IN ADDITION TO TITLE VII THAT SUPPORT CHAPTER 1 GRANTEES.

Indicator 4.1: Increased funding from alternative sources: Up to 76 percent of CILs will have greater than 25 percent of their budget from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 1, and 80 percent of states will contribute more than the required minimum match for Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B.

Targets and Performance Data					Actual Performance	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Percent CILs > 25%**		**Percent States Overmatch Part B**		**Status:** Progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** RSA 704 Report, 1998.
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**		*Frequency:* Annually
1997:	74 %		80 %		**Explanation:** Data are gathered from over 425 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data base by a subcontractor.	*Next Update:* February 2000
1998:						
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**No target set**	**Data not yet available**	**No target set**		**Validation Procedure:** Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.
2000:		75 %		80 %		
2001:		76 %		80 %		
2002:		76 %		80 %		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 5: PROVIDE CHAPTER 2 SERVICES TO INCREASING NUMBERS OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE OLDER AND SEVERELY VISUALLY IMPAIRED, AND INCREASE CONSUMER SATISFACTION.

Indicator 5.1: Increased number of individuals served: The number of older and severely visually impaired individuals served will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Individuals receiving services			**Status:** Target met.	**Source:** Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report), 1997.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually
1994:	14,968		**Explanation:** Target revised because of increased program budget in FY 2000.	*Next Update:* February 2000
1995:	22,103			
1996:	26,846			**Validation Procedure:** Research and Training Center and program staff review data.
1997:	31,460			
1998:	36,280			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**28,500**		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Targets based on estimates of program funding level.
2000:		35,000		
2001:		40,000		
2002:		41,000		

Indicator 5.2: Increased consumer satisfaction: The satisfaction rate in consumers' confidence in ability to perform activities that were "given up" as a result of vision loss will increase, and the percentage of consumers who feel more in control in making decisions on important issues will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Satisfaction Rate in Consumers' Confidence in Ability to Perform Activities "Given Up" as a Result of Vision Loss**		**Percent of Consumers Who Feel More Control in Making Decisions on Important Issues**		**Status:** Progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report), 1997.
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**	**Explanation:** Overall satisfaction rates are not budget dependent.	*Frequency:* Annually
1998:	87%	No target set	76%	No target set		*Next Update:* February 2000
1999:	**Data not yet available**		**No target set**			**Validation Procedure:** Research and Training Center and program staff review data.
2000:		89%		79%		
2001:		90%		80%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Targets based on estimates of program funding level.
2002:		90%		80%		

OBJECTIVE 6: INCREASE FUNDING FOR CHAPTER 2 PROGRAMS FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN TITLE VII, CHAPTER 2.

Indicator 6.1: Increased funding from alternative sources: An increasing percentage of states contribute more than the minimum match amount.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Progress toward revised target likely.	**Source:** 7-OB Report.
1997:	75%			*Frequency:* Annually
1998:	77%		**Explanation:** Grantees must match FY 1999 (discretionary) and FY 2000 (formula) funds during FY 2000. States can make their discretionary match at anytime during FYs 2000 and 2001 because of our extension of their budget period. This is a one-time event caused by the transition from discretionary to formula funding.	*Next Update:* February 2000
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**No target set**		
2000:		25%		**Validation Procedure:** Research and Training Center and program staff review data.
2001:		25%		
2002:		80%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Lowered over match targets for FY 2000 and FY 2001 because of dramatic one-time increase in required state match.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Develop technical assistance action plans to assist grantees that are performing below standards and indicators of compliance.
- Identify and disseminate information regarding best practices for helping individuals with disabilities to achieve appropriate independent living outcomes.
- Develop a monitoring and technical assistance plan for states and CILs, taking into consideration performance on the indicators, requests for assistance, date of last on-site review, and annual financial audit.
- Identify and assist low-performing service providers and CILs.
- With training and technical assistance providers, provide coordinated assistance to CILs on advocacy techniques and strategies.
- Present information at national meetings of CIL directors on the importance of facilitating community change.
- Present national experts on affordable/accessible housing and transportation, personal assistance services, and community-based living arrangements at Regional Services Administration National DSU & SILC Meeting to focus emphasis and encourage new state and local efforts.
- Identify and publish potential funds availability, increase grantees' capacity to obtain grants, and identify and share replicable model local and state resource development techniques and strategies.
- Identify significant outcomes of the Chapter 1 programs and disseminate results to grantees and other potential funding sources.
- Provide technical assistance at national project directors' meeting on the most successful strategies and techniques for increasing and improving service.
- Conduct an independent consumer satisfaction review of all grantees.
- Identify and assist state agencies and CILs with low consumer satisfaction rates.
- RSA will aggregate and share with grantees innovative methods of supporting Chapter 2 activities from sources other than Chapter 2.
- RSA will aggregate examples of outcomes of the Chapter 2 program and share them with grantees and other potential funding sources.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Chapter 1 programs coordinate with HUD, DOL, USDA, HHS, HCFA, and DOT staff. Chapter 2 program coordinates with CDC, HHS, DOL, NIH (NEI, NNAP), DOT, USDA, FDA, HRSA, HCFA, SSA.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Chapter 1 IL goals (1.2) are personal to the consumer and therefore vary tremendously in how difficult they are to achieve and how much time is necessary to achieve goals. There is no national, state, or local standard for goals that would allow exactly similar national grouping of goals. As consumer-based program-serving consumers from cradle to grave with all types of disabilities and virtually unlimited possible goals, it would not be appropriate to establish national standards for goals.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 6.2 and Objective 7 and its indicator were dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- The targets in Indicator 3.1 were decreased.
- In Indicator 5.1, the performance target for 2000 increased from 35,000 to 40,000 because of an increase in program funding from the projected amount.
- Indicator 5.2 has been modified, and a performance target for 2000 was created where there previously was none.
- Because of the substantial increase in the amount of minimum required state match in FYs 2000 and 2001, the target for Indicator 6.1 (the percentage of states contributing more than the required state match) has been lowered.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Goal: Provide leadership in promoting the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities and in assisting states and providers of service under the Rehabilitation Act.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This objective supports Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.
FY 2000—$1,900,000
FY 2001—$1,900,000(Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO ENABLE AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING SERVICES UNDER THE REHABILITATION ACT TO BETTER ASSIST INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES IN OBTAINING MEANINGFUL AND GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENT LIVING.

Indicator 1.1 Successful Technical Assistance: Beneficiaries of technical assistance under the contracted technical assistance project will report that the outcome of the technical assistance which they received was successful in resolving the problem identified in the beneficiary's technical assistance request, and that the efforts completed fulfilled their expectations.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Actual Performance Performance baseline will be established in FY 2000. **Performance Targets** New program plan; no targets established	**Status:** Technical Assistance Center began operating in mid-fiscal year 1998. Data from TA projects completed through FY 2000 will be examined to establish a performance baseline and performance targets for future years. **Explanation:** Newly established program performance plan and indicator. Information obtained from the Technical Assistance Center's followup survey of TA beneficiaries will be used to assess performance. The survey will measure on a scale of 1 to 5 (where a rating of 5 is "completely" and a rating of 1 is "not at all") the extent to which the outcome of the TA was successful in the solving the problem identified in the beneficiary's proposal, and the extent to which the TA fulfilled the beneficiary's expectations.	**Source:** Performance appraisal reports as completed by the beneficiaries of the technical assistance delivery process. *Frequency:* Average project rating will be calculated annually. *Next Update:* September 30, 2000. **Validation Procedure:** The Rehabilitation Services Administration's (RSA's) technical assistance contractor, DTI, Inc., as well as staff from RSA's central and regional offices will perform followup verification to investigate the cause of weak ratings and to assure satisfactory project outcomes. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Limitations include small number of projects; objectivity of rater/self-reporting mechanism; and variation in complexity, scope, cost, and duration of TA project. Revised reporting mechanism will designate a certain score as the minimal level for acceptable performance.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

Not applicable.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To increase the effectiveness of TA, Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) will develop strategies and methods that will assist state VR agencies in conducting appropriate assessments of their performance strengths and weaknesses.
- To increase the effectiveness of TA, RSA will improve processes for identifying state VR agencies with the greatest need for technical assistance.
- To increase the impact of TA efforts, RSA will develop priorities for targeting technical assistance projects, so that the most critical or nationally significant problem areas receive primary attention.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Examples of how projects supported with funds available under the Program Improvement Program have coordinated with other Federal activities to achieve project objectives are listed below:

- To provide opportunities for the exchange of information about successful independent living (IL) programs or services, to better identify and disseminate model approaches, and to develop strategies to address important IL issues, RSA, in conjunction with the Social Security Administration, convened an international conference of selected experts.
- To expand opportunities and options for people with cognitive disabilities, RSA supported the design, development, and reproduction of certain educational and informational materials to promote the objectives of Project Employ, an initiative of the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities.
- To support opportunities for careers in the arts for people with disabilities, RSA, as a followup to the jointly sponsored National Forum on Careers in the Arts, supported a followup conference of selected forum participants to identify specific action steps for implementing recommendations from the forum, in coordination with the National Endowment for the Arts, the Social Security Administration, and the Administration on Developmental Disabilities within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- To better explore employment and other related issues particularly affecting women with disabilities, RSA has jointly sponsored a series of conferences at various locations throughout the country, including an Indian reservation, in partnership with the Social Security Administration.
- To establish a process by which deaf and hard-of-hearing consumers of vocational rehabilitation services in rural areas can obtain more extensive employment services through the use of remote sign language interpreting and computer-aided real-time captioning at workforce center sites, RSA has provided support for a project to demonstrate the utility of video-conferencing technology, in conjunction with funding from the U.S. Department of Labor.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Because of the high degree of autonomy allowed within the joint state/Federal vocational rehabilitation program for state vocational rehabilitation agencies, it is difficult to assure continuing and effective utilization of the improved practices and technologies that are introduced through the delivery of technical assistance.
- Prolonged time spans separating project completion from observable outcomes can sometimes forestall the identification of effective remedial efforts.
- The variety of environments arising from the differences among the structures of state governments, as well as the differences in the economies and demographics of individual states, necessitates shaping program improvement initiatives to suit a range of conditions, and reduces the Federal capacity to take uniform and concerted action in a single direction.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

New—Not applicable.

HELEN KELLER NATIONAL CENTER (HKNC) FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS

Goal: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support Strategic Plan Objective 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.
FY 2000—$8,550,000
FY 2001—$8,717,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE DEAF-BLIND RECEIVE THE SPECIALIZED SERVICES AND TRAINING THEY NEED TO BECOME AS INDEPENDENT AND SELF-SUFFICIENT AS POSSIBLE.

Indicator 1.1 Services to consumers at headquarters: The training program at headquarters will maintain or increase the number of adult consumers and high school students served, the percentage of consumers who complete training and are placed in employment settings, and the percentage of consumers who complete training and return to less restrictive living situations.

Targets and Performance Data									Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Adult		HS		% Placed		% in Less Restricting Settings		**Status:** In FY 1999, the percentage placed in employment and in less restrictive settings exceeded the target. However, the number of adult and high school students served was below the target.	**Source:** Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report for 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Annual report 2000.
Year	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target		
1999:	75	85	16	12	45%	38%	49%	25%		
2000:		90		12		45%		59%		
2001:		90		12		45%		59%	**Explanation:** The figures will fluctuate based on numerous factors, but the targets of 90 adults and 12 high school students is based on historical trends and HKNC believes they represent reasonable targets.	**Validation Procedure:** [illegible] training reports on each client will include [illegible] yment and living situations each client will [illegible] entering upon completion of training.
2002:		90		12		45%		59%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified. A newly developed followup survey is being implemented in FY 2000 that will provide additional data on former students.

518

519

Indicator 1.2 Clients improve functionally: Participants in the core training program at headquarters will increase their skills and abilities in areas such as vocational services, communication, orientation and mobility, and independent living. The target will be established upon receipt of baseline data. The target for 2000 is an 85 percent success rate in achieving training goals.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of identified training goals successfully achieved by participants			**Status:** This is the first year the Individual Training Plan (ITP) has been implemented. It remains to be seen whether or not the data from this year are representative of student performance over a longer period of time. **Explanation:** Since this is the first year the ITP has been used, it will require several years before HKNC can establish firm targets. The targets measure success in achieving training goals.	**Source:** HKNC Annual Report for 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Annual report 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Individual Training Plan (ITP) **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**83.7%**	**No target previously set**		
2000:		84%		
2001:		85%		
2002:		86%		

Objective 2: ENSURE THAT DEAF-BLIND CONSUMERS AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS RECEIVE THE SERVICES THEY NEED TO FUNCTION MORE INDEPENDENTLY IN THE HOME COMMUNITY.

Indicator 2.1 Regional services to consumers and families: Helen Keller National Center will maintain or increase the number of consumers and family members served through its regional offices.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Consumers**		**Families**		**Status:** In 1999, the regional offices served more consumers but fewer families than was targeted. **Explanation:** The number of consumers and families served fluctuates from year to year. In establishing the targets, trend data were used from prior years.	**Source:** HKNC Annual Report for 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Annual report, 2000. **Validation Procedure:** HKNC regional reps maintain client case summary files that indicates rep activity with individual consumers and family members. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Client case summary reports do not measure the impact of the services on the lives of the consumers and family members. There are no improvements planned at this time.
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**		
1999:	**1,336**	**1,250**	**368**	**400**		
2000:		1,300		400		
2001:		1,400		425		
2002:		1,500		450		

OBJECTIVE 3: INCREASE THE CAPACITY OF THE ADULT SERVICE SYSTEM TO MEET THE TRAINING AND SUPPORT NEEDS OF DEAF-BLIND PERSONS IN THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITY.

Indicator 3.1 Services to professionals, organizations/agencies, and affiliate membership: HKNC will maintain or increase the number of agencies/organizations served through its programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** The 976 agencies/organizations served represent an increase of 158 over 1998. **Explanation:** The 818 agencies/organizations served in 1998 was the lowest number in 6 years.	**Source:** HKNC Annual Report for 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Annual report 2000.
1999:	**976**	**No target previously set**		
2000:		950		
2001:		1,000		
2002:		1,050		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedure: Data are compiled through a review of HKNC Regional **Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements:** Reports do not measure the impact of the services provided on the lives of the individuals served by these agencies/organizations. There are no improvements planned at this time.

Indicator 3.2 Training for professionals, agencies/ organizations, and affiliate membership: The number of agencies/organizations receiving training from HKNC through conferences and in-service training will be maintained or increased. Targets will be established upon receipt of baseline data.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** The figure for 1999 includes all individuals attending the conference or training program. This is the first time that this data have been collected. HKNC does not believe that one year of data provides a sufficient basis to targets and plans to wait one more year before setting targets. **Explanation:** HKNC is currently developing evaluation instruments to measure the impact of a number of the types of training it provides. All staff including regional reps, headquarters staff, the National Training Team and the Older Adult Program will use these measurement tools.	**Source:** HKNC Annual Report for 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Annual report 2000. **Validation Procedure:** HKNC is currently developing evaluation instruments to measure the impact of a number of the types of training it provides. All staff, including regional reps, headquarters staff, the National Training Team, and the Older Adult Program, will use these measurement tools. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported from the grantee and are not independently verified.
1999:	**1,420**	**No target previously set**		
2000:		To be established		
2001:		To be established		
2002:		To be established		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To enable HKNC to achieve its overall mission, training will be provided to staff to increase their qualifications, expertise, and job performance.
- To improve HKNC's networking, coordinating, collaborating, and training activities, a national data base of Federal, state, and local service providers will be developed.
- To identify the short-term goals of each client enrolled in HKNC's training program and document the level of attainment, the Individualized Training Program will be utilized.
- To enable family members to provide and obtain services and system improvement, HKNC will conduct national parent meetings with the agendas developed through a needs assessment completed by the family members. HKNC will also continue to provide financial and other support to the National Family Association for the Deaf-Blind (NFADB).
- To increase the number of programs and professionals qualified to work with individuals who are deaf-blind, HKNC will continue to fund new affiliate programs annually, provide an annual affiliate training meeting, and maintain the number of university affiliations and student internships offered.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

To continue to improve the training program offered at HKNC, the Center will do the following:

- Conduct a followup survey to obtain data on employment status and satisfaction with community living (housing, community participation, and supports) and to gain information on goals completed 1year after students leave the HKNC training program.
- As appropriate, include input from family members into the process for identifying goals for the Individualized Training Program. Conduct regular reviews (every 13 weeks) with the family to assess progress.
- To measure the effectiveness of the HKNC's other programs, the Center will do the following:
- Conduct periodic consumer surveys to determine satisfaction with field services.
- Conduct participant assessments of training activities using competency-based evaluations.
- To provide training to a larger number of agencies and professionals serving individuals who are deaf-blind, HKNC will develop a brochure to market the availability of community-based consultations and disseminate this brochure through the regional offices.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- HKNC continues to work closely with a number of Federally funded projects on a range of activities. HKNC staff have presented at conferences hosted by the Mississippi State University RRTC on Blindness and Low Vision and the University of Arkansas, Little Rock, TRTC on Deafness. HKNC currently participates in two Federally funded OSBP projects: the National Technical Assistance Consortium (NTAC), and the National Information Clearinghouse on Children Who Are Deaf-Blind. In addition, HKNC staff sit on a number of advisory boards for Federally funded projects.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The obstacles faced in achieving the overall program goal are due, in large part, to the fact that HKNC is dependent on outside programs for its success. Individuals in need of the training offered at the Center are, at times, not able to attend because of a lack of state funding. Others, upon acquiring the skills necessary to work, return to communities where there is no job available.
- There is a tremendous shortage of personnel qualified to work with individuals who are deaf-blind. There are simply not enough interpreters, O&M instructors, job coaches, rehab teachers, counselors, etc. who have expertise in deaf-blindness.
- To address this shortage, HKNC is committing an increasing percentage of its operating budget to field-based training activities. And the Center continues to expand its affiliate network by providing financial support to new programs each year.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 3.1 is now Indicator 3.2 in the current plan.

Dropped—None.

New

- Indicator 3.1 is new. HKNC offers training to professionals, agencies/organizations, and affiliate membership. HKNC is currently developing evaluation instruments to measure the impact of a number of the types of training it provides.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DISABILITY AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH (NIDRR)

Goal: To support the conduct and dissemination of high-quality research that contributes to improvement in the quality of life of persons with disabilities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support Goal 2, Objective 4 (related to special populations), and Goal 4.
FY 2000—$86,500,000
FY 2001—$100,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: CONDUCT HIGH-QUALITY RESEARCH THAT LEADS TO HIGH-QUALITY RESEARCH PRODUCTS.

Indicator 1.1 Scientific excellence: Grantee research quality is good or excellent, as reflected in research design and its usefulness to customers.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees sampled who had good or excellent ratings			**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** The data sources are the Research Triangle Institute, NC, and Info-Use, CA.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Experts' continuous evaluation of programs.
1997-98:	37 %		**Explanation:** The score of "good" or "excellent" is based on peer review judging several criteria using a Likert Scale instrument.	*Next Update:* May 2000.
1998-99:	**55%**	**No targets previously set**		
1999-00:		60%		**Validation Procedure:** Data are validated by the program experts' review process and contractors' analysis.
2000-01:		65%		
2001-02:		70%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** A larger sample of respondents is being developed to allow for more diverse responses on the usefulness of materials.

Indicator 1.2 Increased publication and citation: Publication of research findings, with the appropriate citation, will increase in refereed journals.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average number of publications per grantee (55 grantees total)			**Status:** Target not met.	**Source:** The data source is the Research Triangle Institute, NC.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Continuous process.
1997-98:	7.1		**Explanation:** Sample size of grantees is too small to represent a valid statement of grantees' performance.	*Next Update:* April 2000.
1998-99:	**No data available**	**No targets previously set**		
1999-00:		Targets to be set		**Validation Procedure:** Data were validated by contractors.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: We are developing a reporting system where grantees can give us detailed information on their publications and type. This system is being pilot tested and preliminary data will be available January 2000.

OBJECTIVE 2: DISSEMINATE AND PROMOTE USE OF INFORMATION ON RESEARCH FINDINGS, IN ACCESSIBLE FORMATS, TO IMPROVE REHABILITATION SERVICES AND OUTCOMES.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Indicator 2.1 Information and TA usefulness: Recipients will find the products, information, and technical assistance that they receive from grantees useful.						
Percentage (and number) of recipients responding "yes," "no," and "N/A" to the question on being served adequately					**Status:** Negative movement away from target. **Explanation:** Information on this indicator is based on Disability and Business Technical Assistance Centers (DBTACs) reporting system ADA Impact Management System (AIMS) only. AIMS is the DBTACs system which procures data about the impact of the technical assistance that centers provide.	**Source:** The data source is the AIMS. *Frequency:* Continuous process. *Next Update:* April 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data are reported by grantees and validated by contractors. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** We plan to address issues of design for collecting information and utilize different formats. Sample is too small.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Yes	No	N/A			
1998:	80% (225)	15% (41)	5% (13)			
1999:	**No data available**			**No targets previously set**		
2000:				83.5% will respond "yes"		
2001:				86.0% will respond "yes"		
2002:				88.5% will respond "yes"		

OBJECTIVE 3: EXPAND SYSTEM CAPACITY FOR CONDUCT OF HIGH-QUALITY REHABILITATION RESEARCH AND SERVICES BY ENSURING AVAILABILITY OF QUALIFIED RESEARCHERS AND PRACTITIONERS, INCLUDING PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES AND OTHER UNDERSERVED GROUPS.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Indicator 3.1 Contributions of trainees and fellows: Contributions by NIDRR trainees and fellows that apply to study rehabilitation will increase.						
Out of 18 individuals surveyed:					**Status:** Unable to judge at this time. **Explanation:** Data gathering activities have not started.	**Source:** The data source is the Research Triangle Institute, NC. *Frequency:* Continuous analysis of data reported in the Performance Management System. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be validated by contractors. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Planning for utilizing the Performance Management System is under way.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Published	**Presentations**	**Published**	**Presentations**		
1998:	(15) 6.7 average	(10) 18.2 average				
1999:	**No data available**		**No targets previously set**			
2000:			Targets to be set			
2001:			Targets to be set			

529

528

Indicator 3.2 Researchers with disabilities and from underserved groups: Participation of researchers working in the field who have disabilities or are from underserved groups will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of people with disabilities and members of minority populations who received NIDRR fellowships			**Status:** Unable to judge at this time. **Explanation:** Pilot test of modified reporting instructions to grantees begins in January 2000.	**Source:** The data source is the Research Triangle Institute, NC. *Frequency*: Continuous analysis of data reported in the Performance Management System **Validation Procedure:** Data will be validated by contractors. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** In 2000 we will begin to pilot test a new set of grantees and will ask for this indicator information.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	No data available	Baseline		
1999:	**No data available**	**No targets previously set**		
2000:		Targets to be set		
2001:		Targets to be set		

OBJECTIVE 4: ENSURE PRODUCTIVITY AND MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS.

Indicator 4.1 Usefulness of NIDRR products: The percentage of customers reporting that NIDRR products and information are useful will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge at this time. **Explanation:** Customer Survey will begin in fall 2000.	**Source:** The data source will be a biennial customer survey. *Frequency*: Biennial customer survey. *Next Update*: Fall 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be validated by contractors. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Customer survey begins in 2000.
1998:	No data available	Baseline		
1999:	**No data available**	**No targets previously set**		
2000:		Targets to be set		
2001:		Targets to be set		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

N/A

New or Strengthened Strategies

- For Indicator 1.1, we will add more questions to the program review on scientific knowledge and excellence and on the quality of grantees' research design. The data will be organized by formative and summative reviews. The formative review will evaluate research design. The summative review will describe the usefulness of the research.
- Indicator 2.1 will be applied to all dissemination and technical assistance projects.
- Indicator 3.1 data will be collected on the number of people trained by research discipline, by disability, and by underserved group. This will be done by adding questions to the Performance Management System.
- Indicator 4.1 data will be collected through a customer satisfaction measurement instrument that will provide us with an information on improving our products and dissemination techniques.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- We work primarily with the Rehabilitation Services Administration and the Office of Special Education Programs. We also coordinate our activities with disability agencies in the Departments of Health and Human Services and Labor.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- OMB clearance for customer survey can take 6 months before final approval.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2 (research usefulness) was dropped because it is incorporated in scientific excellence.
- Indicator 1.4 was dropped because it was too broadly framed.
- Indicators 2.1 (dissemination plan) and 2.2 (product availability) were dropped because data were obtained through grantee self-reporting and because of the limited value of the data as a measurable outcome.
- Indicator 3.3 (impact on field) was dropped because data were obtained through grantee self-reporting.
- Indicator 4.1 (relevant priorities) was dropped because the data to be reported had limited value as a measurable outcome.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Targets have been adjusted in an effort to be more realistic for Indicators 1.1, 2.2, and 3.1.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

532

533

ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Goal: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Goal 2: Objective 2.4—individuals with disabilities will receive technology enabling them to learn, contribute and participate in school consistent with overall high standards; Goal 3:Objectives 3.1 and 3.4—secondary school students and adults with disabilities are provided with accessible information and the technology to support their job potential and lifelong learning; Goal 4: Objective 4.4—all technology investments are accessible to all users including employees and customers.

FY 2000—$34,000,000

FY 2001—$41,112,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: THROUGH SYSTEMIC ACTIVITY, IMPROVE ACCESS TO AND AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY (AT) FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO REQUIRE ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY.

Indicator 1.1 Information: The number of individuals with disabilities who receive information about AT will increase by 10 percent annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of persons who received information			**Status:** No 1999 data but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The significant increase from FY 1997 to FY 1998 is due to an increase in the data sample size (35 states to 42 states) and the implementation of state-operated Web sites facilitating electronic requests for information. Only actual requests for information were counted.	**Source:** 56 state projects have responded to National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) Performance Guidelines (Annual Report). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Fall 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. Nationally recognized organization was recently awarded a technical assistance grant to review existing data collection instrument as to validity, reliability, and accuracy and will revise, refine as necessary, and develop new and improved GPRA-responsive procedures for collecting data. We will continue to use this indicator as it is extremely important and reflects a priority activity of the grantees. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** All states have been using same instrument since 1996. While we have been able to capture some useful data and are able to report on this particular GPRA indicator, the process is cumbersome and lengthy and does not take advantage of technological capabilities. New grantee will develop and assist NIDRR to implement an abbreviated, useful, responsive and user-friendly Web-based approach to data collection.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	88,003			
1998:	614,942			
1999:	**No data available**	**676,000**		
2000:		744,000		
2001:		818,000		

Indicator 1.2 Trained professionals: The number of professionals trained to provide AT services will increase by 5 percent annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of professionals trained			**Status:** No FY 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The FY 1997 data measure professionals trained to provide AT services.	**Source:** All 56 states have responded National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation (NIDRR) Performance Guidelines (Annual Report). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Fall 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as above.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	77,204			
1998:	81,760			
1999:	**No data available**	**86,000**		
2000:		90,000		
2001:		95,000		

Indicator1.3 Barrier reduction: Annually, grantees activities will result in legislative and policy changes that reduce barriers.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of the 56 grantees responsible for change in at least one area			**Status:** No FY 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** 1. The FY 1997 and 1998 data indicate that all states are engaged in barrier reduction work and that the level of effort in barrier reduction increases annually. 2. 90 percent or more of the states have been successful in implementing change. It is difficult, however, to express the outcomes of the work using the current data collection instrument. 3. The FY 1997 and FY 1998 data at left demonstrate that most of the state projects were instrumental in making legislative or policy changes affecting access to AT but does not capture what impact those changes have had on individuals with disabilities.	**Source:** Performance Guidelines. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Fall 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. An important part of the scope of work for the new grantee referred to above is to develop accurate strategies for collecting and reporting barrier reduction related data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as above.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	95%			
1998:	92%			
1999:	**No data available**	**95%**		
2000:		95%		
2001:		95%		

536

Indicator 1.4 Individuals who receive loans: The number of individuals with disabilities who receive loans per $1 million invested will meet or exceed the baseline.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** This new alternative loan program will be funded for the first time in FY 2000. A baseline will be established once data are available.	**Source:** Once established, grantee progress reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2001. **Validation Procedure:** No data to validate. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** N/A.
1997				
1998				
1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		
2000:	N/A	N/A		
2001:				

OBJECTIVE 2: THROUGH PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY, INCREASE ACCESS TO AND FUNDING OF ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVICES AND SERVICES FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.

Indicator 2.1 Funding sources: The number of individuals receiving protection and advocacy services resulting in AT device and/or service will increase 5 percent annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No FY 1999 data available. **Explanation:** This is a new indicator. The Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (Tech Act) was signed into law in November 1998. Section 102 authorizes new grants to states to provide protection and advocacy services.	**Source:** To be determined by new technical assistance grantee. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be provided by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data not yet available. However, developing data collection instrument is part of scope of work of technical assistance provider as described above.
1999:	**No data available**	**No specific target set**		
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Provide technical assistance to states on accessibility issues.
- Attend meetings of professional organizations for special education and vocational rehabilitation; provide technical assistance; and disseminate information about successful activities developed between education programs for children with disabilities and Tech Act projects.
- Increase collaboration with state VR agencies.
- Monitor Tech Act reports for indications of reduction in the number of barriers to accessing assistive technology (AT) by underrepresented populations and rural populations; disseminate information about successful activities to eliminate barriers.
- Provide technical assistance and disseminate information to AT grantees about funding of AT services and devices.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- In order to increase availability of and access to assistive technology (AT) we are working closely with Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), specifically, the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD) and Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), to improve payment for assistive technology devices, systems, and services.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- There have not been any internal ED, GAO, or IG evaluations that have not been addressed.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1 was dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.4 was modified and will now become 1.3.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.3, 1.5, 2.1, and 2.2 have been dropped.

New

- Indicator 2.1 is new.

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Goal: Pre-college-level blind students will receive appropriate educational materials which result in improved educational outcomes.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The American Printing House for the Blind activities support Objectives 2.1 (children enter school ready to learn), 2.2 (every child reads well and independently), 2.3 (every eighth grader masters challenging math), and 2.4 (special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments) in addition to Objective 3.1 (Secondary students get the information, skills, and support needed to prepare for postsecondary education) through its production and distribution of educational materials adapted for students who are legally blind and enrolled in formal educational programs below the college level.

FY 2000—$10,100,000

FY 2001—$10,265,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: APPROPRIATE, TIMELY, HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS ARE PROVIDED TO PRE-COLLEGE-LEVEL BLIND STUDENTS TO ALLOW THEM TO BENEFIT MORE FULLY FROM THEIR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

Indicator 1.1 Customer satisfaction: The American Printing House's customers/consumers will agree that the educational materials provided through the Act are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Trustees			**Status:** 1999 data from Trustees and Consumers are not available as yet, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Survey of Ex Officio Trustees; Input from Research and Publications Advisory Committees; Consumer surveys. *Frequency:* Trustees, Annually; Advisory Committees, Annually; Consumers, Periodically. *Next Update:* Analysis of Trustees' survey, FY 2000; Advisory Committees, May 2000; Analysis of Consumers' survey, FY 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1998:	95%		**Explanation:** In 1998, the ex officio trustees reported that 95 percent of customers/consumers indicated that the educational materials were appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit from their educational programs.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal verification procedure applied.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**95%**		
FY 2000:		96%		
FY 2001:		96%		
Advisory Committees				
FY 1998:	No data available			
FY 1999:	**Highly agree**	**Highly agree**	In FY 1999, the Research and Publications Advisory Committees highly agree that the Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** A consumer survey was conducted in 1999. Data from this survey will be available in FY 2000.
FY 2000:		Highly agree		
FY 2001:		Highly agree	Additional baseline data resulting from analyses of the 1999 surveys of the trustees and consumers will not be available until later in FY 2000.	

Indicator 1.2 Student performance and participation: The percentage of American Printing House ex officio trustees who report that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the Act will be maintained.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Trustees			**Status:** 1999 data from Trustees are not as yet available, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Survey of Ex Officio Trustees: Survey of teachers.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Trustees, Annually; Teachers, Periodically.
FY 1998:	98%		**Explanation:** In 1998, 98 percent of the ex officio trustees reported that student performance and participation in their education programs improved. Analysis of the 1999 Trustees' survey will not be available until later in FY 2000.	*Next Update:* Analysis of Trustees' survey, FY 2000, Teachers, to be determined.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**98%**		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal verification procedure applied.
FY 2000:		99%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The American Printing House is planning to conduct a teacher survey in early 2001.
FY 2001:		99%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To address each of the indicators, the American Printing House for the Blind's existing survey of ex officio trustees will be conducted triennially beginning in 1998. Surveys targeting select issues will be conducted in each of the interim years.
- To address the customer satisfaction issue, the Educational and Technical Research and the Publications Advisory Committees will annually review the Printing House's progress in improving the appropriateness, timeliness of delivery, and quality of products produced through the Act.
- To further address the customer satisfaction issue, ongoing surveys of consumers will be conducted by an outside vendor to provide data regarding the appropriateness, timeliness of delivery, and quality of products produced through the Act.
- To address student performance and participation, ex officio trustees will be surveyed to better understand how materials provided though the Act impact student performance and how to measure the impact.
- To further address student performance, surveys of ex -officio trustees and teachers will be conducted to collect data regarding student performance and participation in their educational programs in relation to materials provided through the Act.

New or Strengthened Strategies

None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The American Printing House for the Blind works cooperatively with Recordings for the Blind, a program supported by the Office of Special Education Programs, on the LOUIS et al Database.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 and 1.2 were adjusted to be more specific.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicators 2.1 and 3.1 have been retained for internal management purposes, and are no longer a part of this report.

New—None.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

Goal: To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research; share National Technical Institute for the Deaf expertise, and expand outside sources of revenue.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The National Technical Institute for the Deaf programs support Objective 1.4 (talented and dedicated teachers in every classroom) through its hiring, retention, and continual development of its specialized faculty. It also supports Objectives 3.1 (secondary students get the information, skills, and support needed to prepare for postsecondary education), 3.2 (postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services needed to enroll in and complete an educational program), and 3.4 (through lifelong learning, adults can enhance their skills and earning power) through its programs and services to prepare students to achieve their postsecondary educational objectives which will ultimately lead to meaningful employment.

FY 2000—$48,151,000

FY 2001—$51,786,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE DEAF AND HEARING STUDENTS IN UNDERGRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES WITH OUTSTANDING STATE-OF-THE-ART TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, COMPLEMENTED BY A STRONG ARTS AND SCIENCES CURRICULUM AND SUPPLEMENTED WITH APPROPRIATE STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES.

Indicator 1.1 Enrollment: Maintain a student body of at least 1,080 undergraduate students, 100 educational interpreter program students, and 50 graduate students.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**			**Status:** Undergraduate and Graduate enrollment targets met. Negative trend away from target in the Educational Interpreter Program enrollment.	**Source:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2000 as of October 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Fall 2000.
	Under-graduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters In Special Ed.	Under-graduate	Educational Interpreters	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.		
FY 1995	1,035	59	10					
FY 1996	1,038	59	27					
FY 1997	1,069	72	32					
FY 1998	1,085	84	36				**Explanation:** The numbers of undergraduates and graduates have increased beyond their target numbers. The Educational Interpreter Program enrollment fell short of its target because of some internal personnel resource problems within the program. These problems have been resolved and the Institute expects increased enrollment numbers next year.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.
FY 1999	**1,135**	**93**	**50**	**1,080**	**100**	**50**		
FY 2000	1,084	77	59	1,080	100	50		
FY 2001				1,080	100	50		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

OBJECTIVE 2: MAXIMIZE THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING A PROGRAM OF STUDY.

Indicator 2.1 Student retention rate: The first-year student overall retention rate will be maintained; sub-baccalaureate will increase; and baccalaureate will be maintained.

Targets and Performance Data

Student retention rates

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
FY 1997:	76%	75%	84%			
FY 1998:	74%	73%	81%			
FY 1999:	**74%**	**69%**	**84%**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:				74%	73%	84%
FY 2001:				74%	74%	84%

Assessment of Progress

Status: In FY 1999, there was a negative trend away from prior years.

Explanation: Unable to judge against 1999 target because the Institute changed its methodology after the target was set. The first-year retention rate decreased slightly to 69 percent in the sub-baccalaureate category in 1999 from the 1998 level. During this year, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf pursued a more rigorous application of the host institution's (Rochester Institute of Technology) suspension and probation policies. The result was higher attrition in the short term, but the expectation is a better environment and better retention over the longer term.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: Fall 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The National Technical Institute for the Deaf has identified several distinct cohorts of students and intends to measure retention rate by cohort and compare the results to the Rochester Institute of Technology and national data.

Indicator 2.2 Graduation rate: The graduation rate for students in sub-baccalaureate and baccalaureate programs will be maintained or increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Student graduation rates

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
FY 1997	50%	50%	51%			
FY 1998:	51%	50%	57%			
FY 1999:	**53%**	**50%**	**61%**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:				53%	51%	61%
FY 2001:				53%	51%	61%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Positive movement in performance from prior years.

Explanation: Unable to judge against 1999 target because the Institute changed its methodology after target was set. In FY 1999, the graduation rate for students in the sub-baccalaureate programs was maintained at 50 percent while the rate for students in the baccalaureate programs was increased to 61 percent providing an overall graduation rate of 53 percent. The Institute's goal is to increase the rate for students in sub-baccalaureate programs to 51 percent and maintain the rate for students in baccalaureate programs at 61 percent in FY 2001.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office Records.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: Fall 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: See information under 2.1.

OBJECTIVE 3: PREPARE GRADUATES TO FIND SATISFYING JOBS IN FIELDS COMMENSURATE WITH THEIR EDUCATION.

Indicator 3.1 Placement rate: An overall 95 percent placement rate of graduates in the workforce will be maintained.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Placement rate			**Status:** No 1999 data but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf Placement Office Records. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* Fall 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** The actual rate for 1998 is equal to the projected target for 1999. The Institute believes that a 95 percent placement rate represents an appropriate ongoing target.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.
FY 1995:	94%		The Placement rates are calculated as the percentage of graduates who are employed among those who want to be employed. Those individuals, who for whatever reason do not seek employment in the respective years, are not included. The Bureau of Labor Statistics uses this same methodology.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1996:	96%			
FY 1997:	97%			
FY 1998:	95%			
FY 1999:	**No data available**	95%		
FY 2000:		95%		
FY 2001:		95%		

OBJECTIVE 4: CONDUCT A PROGRAM OF APPLIED RESEARCH TO PROVIDE INNOVATIVE SUPPORT FOR THE TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESS FOR DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING INDIVIDUALS.

Indicator 4.1 Public input satisfaction assessments: Conduct periodic assessments to determine whether the National Technical Institute for the Deaf is obtaining appropriate public input on all deafness-related research, development, and demonstration activities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge at this time.	**Source:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf Research Report. *Frequency:* Periodically. *Next Update:* To be determined.
FY 1999:	**Baseline to be determined in FY 2000**	**Target will be established upon receipt of baseline data**	**Explanation:** The amendments to the Education of the Deaf Act (October 1998) included a new requirement for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf to seek public input on its deafness-related research priorities. The Institute is working on a mechanism to assess information gleaned from the field. Baseline information will be available in FY 2000 at which time a target will be established.	**Validation Procedure:** To be determined.
FY 2000:				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** To be determined.
FY 2001:				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 5: CONDUCT OUTREACH PROGRAMS FOR EXTERNAL AUDIENCES TO INCREASE THE KNOWLEDGE BASE AND IMPROVE PRACTICE IN THE FIELD.

Indicator 5.1 Consumer satisfaction: Trained participants indicate an above-average rating for the training they receive to serve or work with individuals who are deaf and hard-of-hearing.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Consumer rating			**Status:** Target met.	**Source:** Summary of participant evaluations. *Frequency*: Annually. *Next Update*: FY 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1999:	**Above average**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** The 1999 review of participant evaluations revealed that the average of all participant ratings was "above average." This performance level will be maintained through 2001.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.
FY 2000:		Maintain an above-average rating		
FY 2001:		Maintain an above-average rating		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To address enrollment issues, the Institute will register 350 to 370 new students annually through a comprehensive marketing plan that targets minority students, women students, transfer students, international students, and cross-registered students.
- In an effort to continually attract students to the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, the Institute plans to continually evaluate the need to revise existing curriculum and develop new majors to reflect the changing needs of students and industry.
- To address retention and graduation rates, the Institute continues to develop and implement new instructional practices to enable underprepared students to acquire the skills necessary to complete a postsecondary program of study, including continuing the Learning Community Pilot Project for students who enter underprepared in English and mathematics, strengthening the counseling program for first-year students, and improving support for students outside the classroom, especially in the dormitories.
- To further address the issues of retention, in 1998 the Institute established the Office of Associate Dean for Student Affairs to coordinate programming to improve student persistence. Through counseling and student life services, the office is developing a variety of new strategies to help students better cope with college life. These strategies include developing a formal retention plan that coordinates existing components, including the First-Year Experiences Program, Career Restoration Program, Career Exploration Program, Learning Community Pilot Project, Disability Services for Students with Secondary Disabilities Program, Dormitory Programming, Student Life Team, and Counseling Services.
- In an effort to further improve retention, a research team has been formed to evaluate and report annually on the impact of academic and nonacademic retention strategies. The research team also will report annually on the impact of admissions policies on student retention. In addition, the Institute is conducting a research study to identify special educational needs of students who are (a) undecided on a major and underprepared; (b) decided on a major, but underprepared; or (c) academically prepared, but undecided on a major.
- The Institute will expand and enhance career opportunities for students by responding to changes in the field.
- The Institute will continue to explore new technical career areas that will ensure student's access to emerging careers that can enhance their earning potential.
- The Institute will develop a strategy for determining field satisfaction related to its mechanisms for obtaining public input on research, development, and demonstration activities.
- The Institute will conduct research that advances our knowledge of educational challenges (e.g., reading college-level materials, transfer of skills across domains, matching educational interpreting to student needs) and understanding of the academic potential of deaf and hard-of-hearing students, including students with special needs, in order to optimize their academic success.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To address retention issues, the Institute plans to conduct a study on quality of life for students (residential and nonresidential) and intends to investigate use of students as paraprofessional service providers in the dormitories.
- The Institute will implement a plan for student outcomes assessment response to the Middle States Association recommendations.
- The Institute plans to develop a process to routinely conduct Market Place Scan.
- In an effort to enhance career choices, the Institute plans to submit a proposal to the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Curriculum Committee for Robotics Technology (conceptual development).
- To attract students to the National Technical Institute Program, the Institute plans to expand the Career Awareness Program "on the road."
- To address retention, the Institute plans to determine a Profile of Student characteristics and success for associate degree programs.
- The Institute plans to develop an interim policy on the use of the American College Test (ACT).
- To address placement issues, the Institute plans to expand support to business and industry in accommodating and supporting deaf and hard-of-hearing professionals.
- Enhance the Institute's image by increasing by private and public funding sources' awareness of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf to maintain and strengthen fiscal viability.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- The Vice President for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf serves on the Advisory Board of the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders of the NIH.
- The National Technical Institute for the Deaf collaborates with the IRS and the Social Security Administration to conduct periodic cooperative research studies of the Institute's graduates.
- The National Technical Institute for the Deaf is the recipient of a $5 million Department of Education (Office of Special Education Program) award to provide technical assistance and outreach to institutions of higher education that serve students who are deaf and hard of hearing.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

None.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was expanded to include specific enrollment measures in each of the Instructional Program Areas: Undergraduate Program, Educational Interpreter Program, and Graduate Program.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 6.1 have been retained for internal management purposes and are no longer a part of this report.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New

- Indicator 4.1 added as result of amendment to the 1998 Reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act.

GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

Goal: To challenge students who are deaf, graduate students who are deaf, and graduate students who are hearing, to achieve their academic goals and obtain productive employment, provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing, and establish a sustainable resource base.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Gallaudet University's programs and activities, including those at the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School, support Objectives 1.4 (talented and dedicated teachers in every classroom), 2.1 (children ready to learn), 2.2 (every child reads well and independently), 2.3 (every eighth grader masters challenging math), 2.4 (special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments), 3.1 (secondary students get the information, skills, and support needed to prepare for postsecondary education), and 3.4 (through lifelong learning, adults can enhance their skills and earning power).

FY 2000—$85,980,000

FY 2001—$87,650,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS AND THE MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE KENDALL DEMONSTRATION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WILL OPTIMIZE THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING PROGRAMS OF STUDY.

Indicator 1.1 Enrollment at Gallaudet University: Maintain a minimum enrollment of 1,250 undergraduate and 700 graduate students; 70 students in professional studies; 225 students at the Model Secondary School; and 140 students at the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Undergraduate enrollment			**Status:** Undergraduate and Professional Studies targets met. Positive movement toward targets in Graduate, Model Secondary School, and Kendall School enrollments.	**Source:** Office of Enrollment Services records, FY 2000 enrollment as of October 1999; summarized in Gallaudet's annual report, submitted in 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Fall 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1998:	1,339			
FY 1999:	**1,300**	**1,250**		
FY 2000:	1,318	1,250		
FY 2001:		1,250		
Graduate enrollment			**Explanation:** The number of undergraduates has increased beyond the target number, and the number of students in professional programs met the 1999 target level. Graduate student enrollment numbers dropped slightly in both FY 1999 and FY 2000. Enrollment numbers in the Model School and the Kendall School dropped in FY 1999, but increased in FY 2000 just slightly shy of their respective target levels. Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment targets based on longstanding enrollment targets and historical trends recognizing that actual figures may vary from year to year.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by Gallaudet University. No formal verification procedure applied.
FY 1998:	714			
FY 1999:	**628**	**700**		
FY 2000:	541	700		
FY 2001:		700		
Professional studies enrollment				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1998:	92			
FY 1999:	**70**	**70**		
FY 2000:	86	70		
FY 2001:		70		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Model School enrollment				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1998:	224			
FY 1999:	**209**	**225**		
FY 2000:	219	225		
FY 2001:		225		
Kendall School enrollment				
FY 1998:	137			
FY 1999:	**117**	**140**		
FY 2000:	135	140		
FY 2001:		140		

Indicator 1.2 Student retention rate: Increase the undergraduate retention rate and maintain a minimum retention rate of 90 percent at the Model School/Kendall School.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Undergraduate retention rate			**Status:** There is positive movement toward the undergraduate retention rate in 1999. Model and Kendall exceeded the 90 percent target in 1999. **Explanation:** The undergraduate retention rate target for FY 1999 was 75 percent, and the actual rate was 73 percent.	**Source:** Office of the Enrollment Services records, summarized in the FY 1999 annual report, submitted in 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by Gallaudet University. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Gallaudet plans to analyze studies on factors related to graduation and completion and incorporate appropriate strategies into the university's Retention Improvement Plan.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1998:	72%			
FY 1999:	**73%**	**75%**		
FY 2000:		76%		
FY 2001:		77%		
Model School and Kendall School retention rate				
FY 1998:	85%			
FY 1999:	**92%**	**90%**		
FY 2000:		90%		
FY 2001:		90%		

Indicator 1.3 Student graduation rate: The undergraduate graduation rates at the university will increase. The Model School graduation rate will be maintained.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Undergraduate retention rate			**Status:** The undergraduate graduation rate target was met. For the Model School, there was a negative trend away from target.	**Source:** Office of the Registrar records for collegiate enrollments and Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records for Model and Kendall students, summarized in the FY 1999 annual report, submitted in 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1998:	41%			
FY 1999:	**42%**	**41%**		
FY 2000:		42%		
FY 2001:		43%		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Model School retention rate			**Explanation:** The Model School has implemented a new "fifth year option" for seniors who are not ready to graduate. This action is the result of a decision to make the Model School graduation requirements more rigorous. The graduation rate for FY 1999 is 5 percent lower than for FY 1998 because several seniors who would have graduated in the past year will instead return for a fifth year. In future years, when calculating graduation rates, the Model School will incorporate a 2-year window (students graduating in the fourth and fifth years) at which time we expect that the graduation rate will again be consistent with the stated targets.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by Gallaudet University. No formal verification procedures applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1998:	93%			
FY 1999:	**88%**	**94%**		
FY 2000:		94%		
FY 2001:		94%		

OBJECTIVE 2: CURRICULUM AND EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES PREPARE STUDENTS TO MEET THE SKILL REQUIREMENTS OF THE WORKPLACE OR TO CONTINUE THEIR STUDIES.

Indicator 2.1 Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the University: Ninety-five percent of Gallaudet's Bachelor Degree graduates will either find employment or attend graduate school during their first year after graduation; 50 percent of the Gallaudet students will apply to and be accepted into programs of advanced study beyond the baccalaureate degree.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Graduates in jobs or graduate school during first year after graduation (%)			**Status:** Target exceeded in 1999. **Explanation:** The current levels of 98 percent and 52 percent, respectively, are quite high for college graduates. Gallaudet recognizes that there will be variations in the above rates from year to year, but believes that targets of 95 percent and 50 percent, respectively, represent reasonable long-term targets and intends to maintain these levels during the 2000-2002 period.	**Source:** University studies on the status of graduates' employment, and results of employer surveys, February 2000, and the graduate followup studies, February 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by Gallaudet University. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1998:	95% (1996 grads. in 1997)			
FY 1999:	**98% (1997 grads. in 1998)**	**95% (1997 grads. in 1998)**		
FY 2000:		95% (1998 grads. in 1999)		
FY 2001:		95% (1999 grads. in 2000)		
Graduates accepted into advanced studies programs (%)				
FY 1998:	48% (1996 grads. in 1997)			
FY 1999:	**52% (1997 grads. in 1998)**	**50% (1997 grads. in 1998)**		
FY 2000:		50% (1998 grads. in 1999)		
FY 2001:		50% (1999 grads. in 2000)		

OBJECTIVE 3: RESEARCH CONDUCTED CONTRIBUTES TO HIGH-QUALITY, STATE-OF-THE-ART EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING INDIVIDUALS.

Indicator 3.1 Public input satisfaction: Conduct periodic assessments to determine whether the university and the Model and Kendall Schools are obtaining appropriate public input on all deafness-related research, development, and demonstration activities from infancy through adulthood, and to determine levels of satisfaction for these activities.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Actual Performance: Baseline to be determined in FY 2000. **Performance Targets:** Target will be established upon receipt of baseline data.	**Status:** Unable to judge at this time. **Explanation:** The amendments to the Education of the Deaf Act (October 1998) included a new requirement for Gallaudet University to seek public input on its deafness-related research priorities. The University is working on a mechanism to assess information gleaned from the field. Baseline information will be available in FY 2000 at which time a target will be established.	**Source:** Report on Assessment of public input, summarized in the FY 2000 Annual Report, submitted in 2001. *Frequency:* Periodically. *Next Update:* To be determined. **Validation Procedure:** To be determined. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** To be determined.

OBJECTIVE 4: GALLAUDET WORKS IN PARTNERSHIP WITH OTHERS TO DEVELOP AND DISSEMINATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND MATERIALS FOR DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING STUDENTS.

Indicator 4.1 Use of the Demonstration Schools' expertise: Other programs and/or institutions adopting innovative curricula and other products, or modifying their strategies as a result of Model and Kendall's leadership, will be maintained or increased.

Targets and Performance Data

Programs adopting Model/Kendall Innovative strategies/curricula

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1998:	41	
FY 1999:	**52**	**No target set**
FY 2000:		41
FY 2001:		41

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded in 1999.

Explanation: Although the target was exceeded in FY 1999, we have retained the previously stated performance targets for FY 2000 and FY 2001 until we have more experience with actual performance in this area.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: FY 2000 Demonstration Schools Annual Report, submitted in 2001.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: FY 2001.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by Gallaudet University. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To address enrollment goals, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School will establish annual enrollment goals intended to achieve the requirements of the Education of the Deaf Act related to composition of the student body.
- In an effort to address retention issues, the University will incorporate strategies from studies conducted by Gallaudet into its Retention Improvement Plan and determine factors related to graduation completion rates.
- The University will disseminate information on employment status and additional education obtained by graduates to all academic and support departments to enhance their internal program reviews.
- The Model Secondary School and the Kendall Demonstration School will develop a comprehensive plan to provide students with transition skills, instruction, and exposure to workplace environments.
- The University will increase its support for implementation of research results on campus and at other universities.
- To address the research issue, the University and the Demonstration Schools will develop a strategy for determining field satisfaction related to its mechanisms for obtaining public input on research, development, and demonstration activities.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To further address the research issue, the Demonstration Schools will obtain public input on research related to best practices in the priority areas of family involvement, transition, and literacy.
- The Demonstration Schools will support research on their priorities by university faculty, Model and Kendall teachers, and staff through Gallaudet's internal "Request For Proposal" process.
- The Demonstration Schools will develop partnerships and collaborations with a wide variety of other school programs serving deaf and hard-of-hearing children to identify, develop, test, and disseminate information about best practices and effective educational innovations.
- The Demonstration Schools will develop and implement a national communications network in collaboration with the Gallaudet University Regional Centers.
- Gallaudet will expand programs that best meet the needs of deaf and hard-of-hearing persons, their families, and the professionals who serve them.

New or Strengthened Strategies

N/A.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Gallaudet University coordinates with the Department of Education's (Office of Special Education Program) Postsecondary Education Programs Network to provide technical assistance and outreach services to institutions of higher education that serve students who are deaf and hard of hearing.
- The president of Gallaudet University is a member of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 were combined; Indicators 3.1 and 3.2 were combined; and Indicator 4.2 expanded the research public input measure to also include the University research.

Dropped

- Objective 2 and its Indicators 2.1 and 2.2, and, 3.3, 4.1, 5.1, 5.3, and 6.1 have been retained for internal management purposes and are no longer a part of this report.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- The performance target for "percentage of graduates accepted into advanced studies programs" for FY 2000 changed from 25 percent to 50 percent.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE POLICY

(PELL GRANTS, SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS, WORK-STUDY, PERKINS LOANS, LEVERAGING EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PARTNERSHIPS, FEDERAL DIRECT LOANS, AND FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOANS)

Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive manner.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing student financial aid to help low-income students enroll in and complete postsecondary education.

FY 2000—$11,233,000,000

FY 2001—$13,229,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME STUDENTS WILL HAVE THE SAME ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION THAT HIGH-INCOME STUDENTS DO.

Indicator 1.1 Percentage of unmet need: Considering all sources of financial aid, the percentage of unmet need, especially for low-income students, will continuously decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Average unmet need (the percentage of a student's total cost of attendance that is not met by the expected student and family contribution and all sources of financial aid)

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
Total			
1995-1996:	22%		
1996-1997:	22%		
1998-1999:	**No data available**		**Continuing decrease**
1999-2000:			Continuing decrease
2000-2001:			Continuing decrease
**Low Income Dependent*			
1995-1996:	46%		
1996-1997:	46%		
1998-1999:	**No data available**		**Continuing decrease**
1999-2000:			Continuing decrease
2000-2001:			Continuing decrease
**Low Income Independent*			
	With kids	Without kids	
1995-1996:	54%	49%	
1996-1997:	54%	49%	
1998-1999:	**No data available**		**Continuing decrease**
1999-2000:			Continuing decrease
2000-2001:			Continuing decrease

*Low-income is defined as students in the bottom 20 percent of the income distribution for a given dependency status.

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data; no change in progress.

Explanation: There was no change in the ratio of unmet need to total cost of attendance between the 1995-96 and 1996-97 school years. While Federal student aid is a significant factor affecting unmet need, at least as important are institutional and state decisions regarding the cost of attendance, revenues, and expenditures, which increases the difficulty of meeting the goal of continual decreases in unmet need.

It should be noted that because unmet need represents the amount of additional aid a student could possibly receive under student aid regulations, it does not really reflect the resources students and their families actually use to pay for college. However, trends in unmet need are a good measure of changes in postsecondary affordability.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Baseline: National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS). Updates: Based on administrative records and data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and College Board.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Update: 1997-98 (available in 2000); 1998-99 (available in 2001).

Validation Procedure: Verified by ED data attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: NPSAS data are collected only every four years so that estimates are required for the intervening years. These estimates, while done as carefully as possible, will not necessarily exactly represent the circumstances faced by students in 1996-97. Planned improvements include comparing projections with actual data from the 1999-00 NPSAS and investigating using other, more timely, sources of data to update the various components of unmet need.

Indicator 1.2 College enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students, while the enrollment gap between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority high school graduates will decrease each year.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of high school graduates ages 16-24 enrolling immediately in college

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
Total			
1994:	62%		
1995:	62%		
1996:	65%		
1997:	67%		
1998:	66%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuing increase in rate**
2000:			Continuing increase in rate
2001:			Continuing increase in rate
***Income*			
1994:	Low	High	
	44%	79%	
	Difference: 35%		
1995:	42%	80%	
	Difference: 38%		
1996:	41%	80%	
	Difference: 39%		
1997:	47%	81%	
	Difference: 35%		
1998:	51%	79%	
	Difference: 28%		
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuing decrease in gap**
2000:			Continuing decrease in gap
2001:			Continuing decrease in gap

**Due to small cell sizes, income and racial groups are based on 3-year averages; the year listed is the last year in the series. Income is divided into quintiles, with low-income defined as the bottom quintile and high-income defined as the top quintile.

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data. Progress in reducing the enrollment gap between low- and high-income students is likely, although progress toward increasing the overall enrollment rate is difficult to judge, and no progress has been made in reducing the enrollment gap between minority and white students.

Explanation: The enrollment rate of low-income students (3-year average) has increased 10 percentage points between 1996 and 1998, resulting in a statistically significant reduction in the gap between low- and high-income students between 1997 and 1998. There was also a statistically significant increase in the overall enrollment rate from the 1994-95 period to the 1997-98 period. However, there has been no significant change in the enrollment rate since 1996, making it difficult to judge progress. Finally, there was no statistically significant difference in any of the two years presented between whites and blacks and whites and Hispanics, indicating no progress in reducing the enrollment gap by race. One factor affecting the achievement of this goal is that, while Federal aid is an important factor in promoting college access, outside factors such as academic preparation and the returns to education are probably even more crucial to students' decisions about whether to attend college.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: October Current Population Survey (CPS) conducted by Census.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 1999.

Validation Procedure: Verified by ED data attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Small subgroup sample sizes for low-income and minority students lead to large yearly fluctuations in enrollment rates.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
*Race***						
1994:	Black	White	Hispanic			
	52%	64%	55%			
	Difference: 12% & 9%					
1995:	53%	64%	55%			
	Difference: 11% & 9%					
1996:	53%	65%	51%			
	Difference: 13% & 14%					
1997:	55%	67%	57%			
	Difference: 11% & 10%					
1998:	59%	68%	55%			
	Difference: 9% & 13%					
1999:	**No data available**			**Continuing decrease in gap**		
2000:				Continuing decrease in gap		
2001:				Continuing decrease in gap		

**Due to small cell sizes, income and racial groups are based on 3-year averages; the listed year is the last year in the series. Income is divided into quintiles, with low-income defined as the bottom quintile and high-income defined as the top quintile.

Indicator 1.3 Targeting of Pell Grants: Pell Grant funds will continue to be targeted to those students with the greatest financial need: at least 75 percent of Pell Grant funds will go to students below 150 percent of poverty level.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of Pell Grant funds going to students below 150 percent of the poverty line			**Status:** No 1999 data; progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 1998-99.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Increases in the maximum award without other changes in the formulas used to award Pell grants will tend to lower the percentage of funds going to the neediest students. Therefore, we anticipate that the indicator will continue to trend downward, although we expect to remain above the 75 percent goal for the next few years.	**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED data attestation process.
1996-1997	82%			**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** There are some concerns about the data on income. As a remedy, we will pursue a data match with the IRS to get more accurate income information.
1997-1998	80%			
1998-1999:	**No data available**	**75%**		
1999-2000		75%		
2000-2001		75%		

Indicator 1.4 Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled payments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of repayment will be less than 10 percent.

Targets and Performance Data

The median Federal debt burden of students in their first full year of repayment.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	7.4%	
1995:	7.5%	
1996:	7.9%	
1997:	8.4%	
1999:	**No data available**	**Under 10%**
2000:		Under 10%
2001:		Under 10%

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data; progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: As a general rule, it is believed that an educational debt burden of 10 percent or greater will negatively affect a borrower's ability to repay his or her student loan and to obtain other credit such as a home mortgage. We expect the 1999 median debt burden rate to remain below 10 percent. There is concern about the rise in median debt burden over time. Given that loans play such a major role in enabling students to afford college, limiting their use would be counterproductive in terms of achieving the program's goals regarding postsecondary access and completion, however. As described under strategies, the Department is taking steps, including raising the Pell Grant maximum award and offering flexible repayment plans, to help ensure that borrowers do not become overburdened with debt.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) and Social Security Administration (SSA) earnings records.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 1998 (available in 2000).

Validation Procedure: Verified by ED data attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Debt burden may be overstated because income is based only on earnings, is limited to the amount earned by the individual borrower, and is capped at the maximum amount upon which Social Security taxes are owed ($65,400 in 1997). We are trying to obtain permission to use IRS income data, which would alleviate these limitations.

OBJECTIVE 2: ENSURE THAT MORE STUDENTS WILL PERSIST IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND ATTAIN DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES.

Indicator 2.1 Completion rate: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in 4-year and 2-year colleges will improve, while the gap in completion rates between minority and non-minority students will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of full-time, degree-seeking students completing a 4-year degree within 6 years, and those completing a 2-year degree, earning a certificate or a degree that requires transferring to a 4-year school within 3 years.

4-year rate

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	
1997:	53%	36%	56%	39%	
	Difference: 20% & 17%				
1999:	**No data available**				**Continuing increase in rate**
2000:					Continuing increase in rate
2001:					Continuing increase in rate

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data; progress cannot be judged until trend data are available.

Explanation: Approximately one-half of full-time degree-seeking students complete a 4-year degree within 6 years, and one-third complete a 2-year degree or certificate or transfer to a 4-year school within 3 years. Completion rates for black and Hispanic students are lower than those of white students.

It should be noted that the completion rates reported here are understated to the extent to which students complete their degree at a different institution from the one they began at. The extent of the underestimation appears to be about 10 percentage points.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) conducted as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Student Aid Study (IPEDS).
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 1998 (available in 2000).

Validation Procedure: Verified by ED data attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Postsecondary institutions are not required to report graduation rates until 2002. However, data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of 4-year students and 74 percent of 2-year students. Investigating whether a proxy for graduation rates for student aid recipients can be obtained from administrative records.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**				**Performance Targets**		
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic			
2-year rate							
1997:	31%	23%	33%	26%			
	Difference: 10% & 7%						
1999:	**No data available**				**Continuing increase in rate**		
2000:					Continuing increase in rate		
2001:					Continuing increase in rate		

OBJECTIVE 3: ENSURE THAT TAXPAYERS WILL HAVE A POSITIVE RETURN ON INVESTMENT IN THE FEDERAL STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

Indicator 3.1 Return on investment: The benefits of the student aid programs, in terms of increased tax revenues, will continue to exceed their costs.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Source:** March Current Population Survey (CPS) and Beginning Postsecondary Student (BPS) study with imputations from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) and High School and Beyond (HS&B). Behavioral assumptions were derived, where feasible, from meta-analyses conducted by Leslie and Brinkman in their 1988 book, The Economic Value of Higher Education. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
	Low	Best	High			
1996:	$1.40	$3.03	$7.15		**Explanation:** The estimated return on investment is calculated in the following manner: 1) The discounted present value of tax revenue and welfare benefits is calculated for different educational attainment levels. 2) Under the "best" scenario, 90 percent of the revenue differential calculated in step 1 is assumed to be caused by obtaining more education. 3) Under the "best" scenario, for every $100 received by a student in federal grant aid, 1 percent of the revenue differential calculated in step 2 is assumed to be caused by student aid. It is also assumed that grants and loans are equally cost-effective. 4) The revenue differential calculated in step 3 is divided by the cost to the Federal government of providing the aid.	
1997:	$1.42	$3.08	$7.27			
1998:	$1.46	$3.16	$7.49			
1999:	**$1.54**	**$3.36**	**$7.97**	**No target set**		
2000:				Greater than $1		
2001:				Greater than $1		
Low: A pessimistic set of assumptions leading to a low-end estimate of the return on investment. Best: The set of assumptions that we believe best captures the return on investment. High: An optimistic set of assumptions leading to a high-end estimate of the return on investment.					Based on this calculation, the best estimate is that the student aid programs return over $3 to Federal taxpayers in terms of increased tax revenue and reduced welfare payments for every $1 spent on the student aid programs. Even using very conservative assumptions, the low estimate is still almost 50 percent higher than the $1 break-even point.	**Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED data attestation process. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** A number of assumptions and imputations are required to estimate the return on investment. We are planning on having an independent expert review the methodology and to suggest possible areas of improvement.

OBJECTIVE 4: ENCOURAGE POSTSECONDARY STUDENTS TO ENGAGE IN COMMUNITY SERVICE.

Indicator 4.1 Community Service: The percentage of Federal Work-Study (FWS) program funds spent on community service, in particular America Reads and America Counts, will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of Federal Work-Study program funds spent on community service

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Total	America Reads*	
1997:	11%	Not applicable	
1998:	10%	2.5%	
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuing increase**
2000:			Continuing increase
2001:			Continuing increase

* Because it is not known what percentage of spending on America Reads meets the statutory definition of community service, the extent to which America Reads spending is captured in the total for community service cannot be determined. It is assumed that there is a great deal of overlap.

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data; progress toward target difficult to judge.

Explanation: The percentage of FWS funds spent on community service declined slightly between 1996/97 and 1997/98. This was likely caused by the large increase in program funding between those two years. Community service positions are more difficult to establish than other positions so that institutions may have found it hard to create new community service positions with their increased funding. The percentage of FWS funds spent on community service should begin to increase as institutions adjust to their new increased funding levels and begin creating additional community service positions.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 1998-99.

Validation Procedure: Verified by ED data attestation process.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- If enacted, the Department's FY 2001 budget would provide more than $54 billion in grant, loan, and work-study assistance to 8.6 million postsecondary students.
  - An $8.4 billion request for Pell Grants would increase the maximum award by $200 to $3,500, the highest ever and more than 50 percent higher than the maximum grant in 1993, and would provide grants to nearly 3.9 million students.
  - A $1,011 million request for Work-Study (an increase of $77 million) would allow approximately 1 million students to work their way through college.
  - The FY 2001 budget provides a $60 million increase (to $691 million) for Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, the largest increase in 10 years. The grants will serve an estimated 1.2 million students.
  - The Federal Family Education Loans and Federal Direct Student Loan programs would provide 9.4 million loans totaling an estimated $43 billion in funds available to support postsecondary students.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Help minimize debt burden by implementing and promoting lower interest rates, offering flexible repayment options, providing electronic exit counseling, and minimizing the frequency with which interest is capitalized.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The Student Financial Assistance Programs complement other Federal efforts to reduce the net price of a postsecondary education for families and students. The newly proposed College Opportunity Tax cut, in conjunction with the already available Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning tax credits, will reduce the Federal income tax liability of those enrolled in postsecondary education. Other examples of Federal tax-related efforts to help students and their families pay for college include tax-free investments for college such as Series EE U.S. Savings bonds and tax-preferenced college savings vehicles, including the Education IRA.
- The Student Financial Assistance Programs also complement other Department efforts involved in preparing precollege students, often as early as middle school, for the academic rigors of college. These other programs, in particular Upward Bound and GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs), provide grantees with funding for counseling, mentoring, and other support activities which, when combined with financial aid, help ensure that students are both academically and financially able to enroll in and complete college.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- While the student financial aid programs play a key role in achieving the goals described above, a number of other factors beyond the control of the programs also affect the attainment of these goals. The state of the economy, student and family motivations and expectations, funding decisions made by postsecondary institutions and state governments, and changes in elementary and secondary education all play an important role in determining whether the program goals are achieved.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.4, the Federal debt burden indicator, was changed from looking at the percentage of borrowers with debt burdens in excess of 10 percent to median debt burden being less than 10 percent to better reflect conditions being faced by "typical" borrowers.
- A comparison of low- and high-income students was dropped from Indicator 2.1 because the data source now being used for this indicator, which is available on an annual basis rather then every 8 years as was the prior data source, does not contain information on income.

Dropped

- Indicator 3.1, the employment rate indicator, which compared the rate at which student aid recipients obtained jobs with that of nonrecipients, was eliminated because it was felt that the return on investment indicator better measured the economic effects of the student aid programs and the employment rate indicator could be updated only every 4 to 8 years.

New—None.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

(PELL GRANTS, SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS, WORK-STUDY, PERKINS LOANS, LEVERAGING EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PARTNERSHIPS, FEDERAL DIRECT LOANS, AND FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOANS)

Goal: Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and responsive to customers.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: SFA's primary mission is to help put America through school by delivering Federal student aid to 8.5 million students and their families every year. As the Federal government's first performance-based organization, SFA is designed to better focus resources and management expertise on student financial assistance issues by establishing clear goals and incentives for improved performance. To successfully achieve this result, SFA is instituting a balanced score card approach to managing its business operations. It focuses on three basic indicators and goals: improving customer satisfaction; lowering unit cost; and, because it is essential to improving both, employee satisfaction. The balance score card and associated activities as laid out in SFA's 5-Year Plan directly support Objective 3.3 of the Strategic Plan.

FY 2000—$11,233,000,000

FY 2001—$13,229,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION.

Indicator 1.1 Increase Customer Satisfaction to a comparable private sector industry average—American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) rating of 74 *(out of a possible score of 100)*—by FY 2002.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. This is a new methodology for customer satisfaction monitoring for 2000. The 1999 result will be used to help develop future benchmarks.	**Source:** American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), National Quality Research Center (NQRC) at the University of Michigan. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Summer 2000.
1999:	**ACSI rating was 63. However, this result was based just on SFA's student application process.**	**No target set**		
2000:	SFA will expand the measure to include each of our 10 core business processes.	As a down payment on our commitment to improving services, at least 70 percent of surveyed respondents will report improvement in at least 6 of the 10 core business processes.	**Explanation:** The ACSI uses a widely accepted methodology to obtain standardized customer satisfaction information for all of its participants. Over 170 private-sector corporations use ACSI. Because it is widely used across all business sectors it allows us to benchmark and compare ourselves to the best in business.	**Validation Procedure:** Verified by Dept of ED attestation process and ED.
2001:		Once baseline is established we will be able to come up with a valid FY 2001 goal.	Business processes align directly to customer channels. The Student Channel processes include Aid Awareness, Aid Application, and Loan Repayment. The School Channel processes include Aid Origination and Disbursement, Program Eligibility, Program Support, and Financial Transactions. The Financial Partners Channel processes include Program Eligibility, Program Support, and Financial Transactions.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None noted.
2002:		ACSI rating of 74 or comparable to overall measure of the finance and insurance industry.		

OBJECTIVE 2: DECREASE UNIT COSTS.

Indicator 2.1 By FY 2004, reduce actual unit costs from projected unit costs by 19 percent.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		**Status:** Unable to judge – this is a new measure for SFA PBO 2000-04 5-Year Plan. **Explanation:** Unit Costs are defined as total costs in a fiscal year divided by the number of unduplicated recipients of loans and grants. (Actual or targeted unit costs are the goals SFA is setting for itself. Projected unit costs are based on forecasts. They increase rapidly during the next 5 years because of the rapid growth in the Direct Loan portfolio and a maturation of the portfolio to the most expensive component of loan servicing.) Anecdotal information suggests that we are making progress: mailing costs are down; e-filings are increasing; and the consolidation of our computer systems will yield cost reductions.	**Source:** The cost component comes from the FY 98 appropriated funds budget – including out-year estimates. The number of recipients comes from the Office of the Undersecretary. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None noted.
		Budgeted Unit Cost Target (Approximated)	Unit Cost Reduction from Projected (Approximated)		
1999:	**Not available**	**No target set**	**No target set**		
2000:	FY 2000 is baseline year	28.50	No Reduction*		
2001:		28.00	-3%		
2002:		26.80	-9%		
2003:		25.85	-13%		
2004:		24.55	-19%		
*In FY 2000, SFA will reduce operating expenses by $18 million so that it can invest more heavily in technology to make operations more efficient. Consequently, there are no unit cost savings in FY 2000; however, unit cost will begin to fall in FY 2001.					

OBJECTIVE 3: INCREASING EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION.

Indicator 3.1 Improve SFA's ranking of employee satisfaction in the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) and National Performance Review's (NPR) employee opinion survey from 33rd to top 5 by 2002.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
SFA Employee satisfaction ranking			**Status:** Unable to judge—this is a new measure for SFA PBO 2000-2004 5-Year Plan. The 1998 and 1999 data should be used as benchmarks. **Explanation:** Satisfaction is measured by responses to the survey question, "Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?" Although no specific target was set for 1999, the slight decline in ranking is not unexpected given that the survey was conducted during an SFA-wide reorganization and while many employees were transitioning to new senior-level managers. Since the NPR survey did not provide information at the work unit level, an additional survey is currently under way. Employees and managers with the help of our SFA University will use the results of these surveys to help to resolve issues and concerns.	**Source:** National Partnership for Reinventing Government Survey. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* January 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data are supplied by NPR and OPM. No formal attestation procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None noted.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	33rd out of 49			
1999:	**38th out of 49**	**No target set**		
2000:		Increase from 1999. (Also achieve success in five big issues our Labor-Management Partnership Council identifies and make demonstrable progress on those five issues this year.)		
2001:		Increasing rank from 2000.		
2002:		Top 5 of all agencies.		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- **Interim Performance Plan to improve service, reduce cost and transform SFA into a PBO.** When the PBO was established in fall 1998, an interim performance plan was developed to achieve three key objectives: improving customer satisfaction; reducing the overall cost of delivering student aid; and transforming the student financial assistance office into a performance-based organization. The plan was to cover activities through the end of FY 1999. The plan's major milestone activities and key performance measures were included in the Department's FY 2000 Annual Plan. By the end of the fiscal year, most of what SFA set out to accomplish had been achieved, and additional customer-suggested items not included in the initial plan were also completed. A report on the status of last year's plan can be obtained from the Web site: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/. In January 2000, the working version of our 5-year performance plan was made available to customers, partners, and stakeholders. This new plan builds upon the interim experience and focuses on achieving three objectives: improved customer satisfaction, improved employee satisfaction, and lower unit cost. The new plan can also be found at the Web address cited above.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- **SFA 5-Year Plan to improve employee and customer satisfaction and lower unit costs.** The Student Financial Assistance (SFA) 5-year plan details specific projects that will help SFA move closer to achieving improved customer and employee satisfaction as well as lowering unit costs. These projects are listed in Attachment A of the plan and will be accomplished by the close of FY 2000. They include such improvements as establishing one toll-free number for "one call does it all" customer service, simplifying the aid application, allowing Web-based access to the aid application, and so forth. The plan also includes internal performance measures that will help ensure that operations continue to run smoothly.
- **Modernize and improve the delivery system for SFA programs.** To achieve better service at lower costs, as well as the statutory requirements detailed in the PBO legislation; SFA must integrate and modernize its existing stovepiped, mission-critical databases. The System Modernization Blueprint provides a mechanism for accomplishing this task. Borrowing from the best-in-business practices in the financial sector, SFA will utilize middle ware to create applications that are focused on each customer channel and draw from common data that are stored only once. The Blueprint spells out projects to put in place in a modular fashion and the appropriate timing or sequencing for accomplishing activities.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- We perform data matches with numerous Federal agencies to ensure applicants are eligible to participate in Federal assistance programs. These agencies include the Selective Service, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Social Security Administration, Veterans Affairs, and Treasury.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Because this objective involves primarily internal ED initiatives, there are no external factors that should affect achievement of the objective.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

When the PBO was established in fall 1998, an interim performance plan was developed to achieve three key objectives: improving customer satisfaction; reducing the overall cost of delivering student aid; and transforming the student financial assistance office into a performance-based organization. The plan was to cover activities through the end of FY 1999. Its major milestone activities and key performance measures were included in the Department's FY 2000 Annual Plan. It represented a substantial departure from our previous plans provided in GPRA and centered on our **customer segments**—students, schools, and financial institutions—not programs as in the 1999 plan. Indicators that were no longer strategically aligned with the interim performance plan objectives were dropped. Many of these measures will still be tracked internally and reported quarterly and annually to customers, partners, and stakeholders.

Adjusted

- Program Outcome Measures are included under a separate plan called "Student Financial Assistance Policy."

Dropped

- Indicators previously contained in the OPE section include QA Participation Rate, Compliance Rate, Application Data Quality, Timely Delivery of Programs, Effectiveness of Case Management Targeting, Sustainment Rate, Institutional Cash Management, Administrative Costs, Increased Use of Electronic Applications, and Data Quality.
- Dropped indicators previously contained in the Pell section include Contract Performance and Positive Audit Results.
- Indicators previously contained in the Campus-Based Program section include Percentage of Funds Available for Reallocation, Percent of Funds Spent on Community Service, Student Placement Rates, Collection Rate, Contract Performance, and Positive Audit Results.
- Indicators for Student Incentive Grant Program include Availability of Program Fund and Leveraging Effects.
- Indicators for the Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program include Gross Default Rate, Loss Rate, Annual Delinquency Rate, Contract Performance, FFEL Financial Statements, Lender and Guaranty Agency Lender Results, and Strengthening the Quality of Audits.
- Indicators for the Direct Loan Program include Institutional Participation Rate, Gross Default Rate, Loss Rate, Annual Delinquency Rate, Contractor Performance, and Positive Audit Results.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None

Dropped—None

New—None.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

PERKINS VOCATIONAL AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION (STATE GRANTS AND TECH-PREP INDICATORS)

Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Funds provided to states through vocational education state grants and tech-prep education support the six objectives outlined in our program plan. These objectives have been aligned with core measures identified in Perkins III, which states will use to promote continuous program improvement in academic achievement and job skills attainment, and to promote positive student outcomes at the state and local levels. State performance measures and GPRA program plan objectives are now aligned with the Department's Strategic Plan, Objective 1.2, (schools help all students make successful transition to college and careers).

FY 2000—$1,161,650,000

FY 2001—$1,161,650,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT VOCATIONAL CONCENTRATORS, INCLUDING SPECIAL POPULATIONS, WILL ACHIEVE HIGH LEVELS OF PROFICIENCY IN MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, AND ENGLISH.

Indicator 1.1 Academic attainment: The percentage of vocational concentrators, including special populations, meeting the core curriculum standards will increase from baseline data.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of vocational concentrators meeting core curriculum standards (*)			**Status:** No 1999 data but strong progress toward target is being made. **Explanation:** Introduction of higher graduation requirements (in terms of both courses and assessment) in many states is driving vocational students, including those in special populations, to take more academics.	**Source:** National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 1990, NAEP 1994, NAEP 1998. *Frequency:* Approximately every 4 years. *Next Update:* NAEP 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This indicator will eventually be replaced with a better measure of academic attainment—performance on state-established academic proficiencies—as specified in the 1998 Perkins Act.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1989-1990:	19%			
1993-1994:	33%			
1997-1998:	45%			
1998-1999:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		
1999-2000:		Continuing increase		
2000-2001:		Continuing increase		
2001-2002:		55%		

*Core curriculum standards include 4 years of English and 3 years each of math, science, and social studies. This course sequence is the basis for a college preparatory curriculum.

Indicator 1.2 Academic attainment: Increasing proportions of vocational concentrators will meet state-established mathematics standards.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of vocational concentrators meeting state-established mathematics standards, measured using state-established approaches

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Target
	High-Stakes Test	Low-Stakes Test	Course Completion	
1997-1998:	95% (2)	49% (1)	77% (1)	
1998-1999:	**No data available**			**Continuing increase**
1999-2000:				Continuing increase
2000-2001:				New targets will be set

*In parentheses () is the number of reporting states.

Assessment of Progress

Status: Because only baseline data from a small number of states are available on this indicator, it is not possible to judge status at this time.

Explanation: Performance reporting is shifting from a reliance on infrequent national surveys to state accountability reports as specified by the 1998 Perkins Act. In 1999, a small number of states participated in a pilot project on performance reporting, too few to represent a national sample. By 2001, most, if not all, states will be reporting on academic attainment.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Performance reports from 4 states in a data pilot project.
Frequency: To be determined.
Next Update: To be determined.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by 4 states. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance data are now based on few states and measured by states in different ways. *Planned Improvements:* By 2001 a national sample of states will be used to set targets and assess progress. More consistency in measurement will be sought.

OBJECTIVE 2: ENSURE THAT INSTITUTIONS, SECONDARY AND POSTSECONDARY, WILL OFFER PROGRAMS WITH INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED SKILL STANDARDS SO THAT CONCENTRATORS, INCLUDING SPECIAL POPULATIONS, CAN EARN SKILL CERTIFICATES IN THESE PROGRAMS.

Indicator 2.1 Skills proficiencies: An increasing proportion of secondary and postsecondary institutions will offer programs in which vocational students can earn industry-recognized skill certificates. (Program measures to be reassessed in 2000 to reflect new law.)

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of secondary schools and postsecondary programs that allow some students to earn industry-recognized skill certificate

Year	Secondary		Postsecondary	
	Actual Performance	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1995-1996:	12.9%			
1996-1997:	13.1%			
1997-1998:	14.6 %			
1998-1999:	**No data available**	**15%**	**87%**	**Continuing increase**
1999-2001:		New target to be set		New target to be set
2000-2001:		Continuing increase		Continuing increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Secondary – Positive movement toward target. Postsecondary – Because only baseline data available on this indicator, it is not possible to judge status at this time.

Explanation: The shift in performance reporting to rely on state accountability reports is likely to require a change in this indicator in 2000. By that time, states will be reporting on the number of students meeting state-established vocational-technical skill proficiencies, as required in the new law. No state data on this new indicator available at this time, however.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: National STW Evaluation.
Frequency: Annual until 1999.
Next Update: 2000.

NCES Survey of Skill Certificates offered in Postsecondary Programs, 1999.
Next Update: None.

Validation Procedure: Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data currently obtained from an evaluation survey, which will end shortly, and from a one-time NCES survey. *Planned improvements:* By 2000 the survey data sources above will be phased out and replaced state performance reporting of technical skill proficiencies as specified by the 1998 Perkins Act.

OBJECTIVE 3: ENSURE THAT CONCENTRATORS, INCLUDING SPECIAL POPULATIONS, MAKE TRANSITIONS TO CONTINUING EDUCATION, WORK, OR OTHER CAREER OPTIONS.

Indicator 3.1 Secondary student outcomes: An increasing proportion of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will attain high school diplomas, enter postsecondary programs, or attain employment.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of vocational concentrators who have graduated from high school and transitioned to postsecondary education or employment				**Status:** No 1999 data but positive movement toward target is likely. **Explanation:** National and evaluation surveys indicate increasingly positive outcomes for vocational students. The shift to reliance on state accountability reports for this indicator (likely in 2001) will require a new target to be set at that time.	**Source:** National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) 1994 Follow-up Survey of 1992 Graduates. *Frequency:* One sample of grads. *Next Update:* None. **Source:** National STW Evaluation Follow-up Survey of Seniors in 8 states. *Frequency:* 3 cohorts of graduates. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** For NELS: Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards. For the National STW Evaluation Data: Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these finds. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** NELS data are a nationally representative sample, while the STW Evaluation Survey is representative of seniors in 8 states and the sample of vocational students too small to disaggregate by special population group. *Planned Improvements:* The shift to state performance reporting will allow more frequent data on secondary student outcomes, with disaggregated reporting being phased in as required by the 1998 Perkins Act. Future targets will be based on data collected from the states.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Target**		
		Graduates in 1992 / 1996			
	All concentrators				
	Postsecondary Ed.*	56% / 74%			
	Employment*	77% / 66%			
	Concentrators who are female				
	Postsecondary Ed.	63% / **			
	Employment	80% / **			
	Concentrators with disabilities				
	Postsecondary Ed.	30% / **			
	Employment	79% / **			
	Concentrators who are in racial minority groups				
	Postsecondary Ed.	58% / **			
	Employment	71% / **			
	Concentrators who are educationally disadvantaged				
	Postsecondary Ed.	44% / **			
	Employment	82% / **			
	*Measured as (1) ever enrolled in postsecondary education in 18 months since high school graduation and (2) employed full- or part-time at 18 months after graduation. **Sample size too small to break out.				
1999:	**No data available**		**Continuing increase**		
2000:			Continuing increase		
2001:			New target to be set based on state reporting		
2002:			Continuing increase		

Indicator 3.2 Postsecondary student outcomes: Increasing proportions of postsecondary vocational students, including special populations, will have a positive placement in one or more of the following categories of outcomes: retention in and completion of a postsecondary degree or certificate, placement in military service, or placement or retention in employment.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students entering postsecondary vocational majors in specified year who, 4 years later.					**Status:** Because only baseline data are available on this indicator, it is not possible to judge status at this time.	**Source:** Beginning Postsecondary Study, 1994 Follow-up of 1990 Cohort. *Frequency:* 5 years. *Next Update:* 2001.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
Entering Cohort	Still Enrolled	Completed Degree/Certificate	Completed and Employed			
1989-1990:	24%	52%	73%		**Explanation:** The shift to reliance on state accountability reporting will require new targets to be set in 2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.
1995-1996:	Data available in 2001					
1998-1999:	**N/A**			**Continuing increase**		
1999-2000:				New target to be set based on state data		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The 1998 Perkins Act requires all states to collect and report data on postsecondary post-program placement, including for special populations. By 2000, performance targets will be based on data collected from a national sample of states.
2000-2001:				Continuing increase		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Establishing greater accountability for the outcomes of vocational education at all levels is a challenging yet worthwhile goal. The Perkins Act of 1998 supports this goal by specifying core indicators for state performance; however, states are only beginning to develop capacity to collect and analyze the quality of data needed to report on these indicators. The challenge in using state data is exacerbated by the differences in state definitions of who is a vocational education student, the scope of vocational education programs, and the variation in approaches to measurement. We have therefore provided leadership and technical assistance that support state efforts to build quality accountability systems, in the form of (1) intensive dialogue and technical assistance workshops with states to create a common core indicator framework; (2) partnership with states to develop quality criteria and scoring rubrics for use in improving measurement approaches and accountability systems; (3) partnerships with state data collection associations, the Accountability Committee of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational-Technical Education, the National Governors Association, the Department of Labor, and other key stakeholders; (4) planning and implementation of the first National Institute on Planning for Performance, which brought together--in some cases for the first time-- teams of stakeholders representing various segments of the vocational enterprise within states; and (5) a secondary education data pilot project with 8 states.
- A major goal of Perkins 1998 is to improve the academic performance of vocational and technical education students. We have therefore provided leadership and technical assistance on strategies that promote education reform leading to improved student performance at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. Assistance includes hosting regional technical assistance workshops with state leaders; identifying and disseminating effective state strategies in guidance and counseling and teacher professional development; and coordinating with and promoting relevant Department of Education initiatives, such as New American High Schools, School-to-Work, Improving America's Schools, and the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program.
- The new law further emphasizes the importance of raising students' vocational and technical skill proficiencies, but there is a prior need for standards and voluntary assessments of skills that are recognized by both industry and postsecondary education. To address this lack, we have partnered with states, industry, and other Federal agencies in developing and implementing challenging curriculum and voluntary assessments. Activities include identification and adoption of 16 career clusters, with standards and assessments to be developed tied to state academic and industry-recognized standards; leading and providing technical assistance to Building Linkages in High Tech Career Clusters initiative and disseminating results; and partnering with the Department of Labor to align and coordinate the O*NET database of occupational information to Building Linkages initiative.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To provide further support to states as they transition to quality performance reporting, strategies include partnering with states to, in turn, provide technical assistance and professional development to increase capacity of the local educational agencies from which they receive data; enabling all states to participate in an expanded secondary education data pilot project; leading an additional data pilot project with state postsecondary education representatives; providing leadership on a collaborative project with the Department of Labor, the National Governors Association, and 4 states to develop a Baldrige-based continuous improvement framework that will promote development of common accountability measures for services provided under both the Workforce Investment Act and the Perkins Act; providing technical assistance to states to implement a continuous improvement framework for their state and local accountability systems.
- To conduct National Institutes on Planning for Performance for additional states, to continue to bring programs together to help them think strategically about how to coordinate and align strategies and investments to lead to improved student performance.
- To support the newly identified 16 career clusters and student attainment of technical skill proficiencies, partner with the states to identify, develop, and implement related voluntary assessment and curriculum resources.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

All Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) activities to support states and meet program goals are based on collaboration and coordination with related Federal activities. The core activities specified in the 1998 Perkins Act provide a vehicle for connection not only to Department of Education reform initiatives aimed at improving student academic achievement and preparation for college, but also to Federal workforce development initiatives aimed at preparing adults for careers.

- In providing leadership and technical assistance on education reform, OVAE is collaborating with the National School-to-Work Office, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Department's Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program, Improving America's Schools Conferences, and America Counts initiative.
- In developing tools and products to support state efforts to build shared accountability systems, OVAE collaborates with the Office of the Under Secretary's Planning and Evaluation Services, Division of Adult Education, Office of Vocational Rehabilitative Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Labor, and other key stakeholders such as the National Governors Association.
- To develop curricula and assessments in 16 broad career cluster areas, OVAE is partnering with key stakeholders in broad career clusters, including the Department of Transportation Garrett-Morgan initiative and the Garrett-Morgan Roundtable of Industry leaders, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor/Employment and Training Administration/O*NET, and the National School-to-Work Office.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- One of the substantial challenges OVAE currently faces is tracking progress toward our program goal. The new law (Perkins 1998) specifies core indicators for state performance reporting, but states are only beginning to develop capacity to collect and assess the quality of data needed to meet the new requirements. Much progress is being made; however, limited state data were available in 1999. Our program performance plans reflect this: both the imminent change in some performance indicators and our lack of data at this time. The use of state data to set performance targets and report progress is preferable, as it will provide a clear link between the Federal investment and strategies, and results at the state and local level. OVAE has spent the past 8 months working intensively with secondary and postsecondary education and key stakeholders in all states to identify the challenges and limitations to collecting, reporting, and analyzing state data as required by the 1998 Perkins Act. The challenge in using state data is exacerbated by the differences in state definitions of who is a vocational education student, the scope of the vocational education programs, the variation in approaches to measurement, and state and local capacity to collect the data.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 modified from standardized assessment instruments to "core curriculum standards" and "state-established math standards."

Dropped

- Objectives 4 through 8 were dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- **Indicator 1.1 Academic Attainment** – Changed title of high-level academic curriculum from "New Basics" to "core curriculum standards" to better reflect the emphasis and the commitment in the states to help all students, including those students who participate in vocational education courses, master a set of core curriculum standards. "New Basics" might inadvertently be interpreted as minimal requirements versus rigorous academic requirements.
- **Indicator 1.2 Academic Attainment** – Changed math achievement indicator from "math gains" to "met state-established proficiency targets" to more closely reflect changes in the 1998 Perkins Act.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

Adjusted

- **Indicator 2.1 Skill Proficiencies** – For secondary-level measurement, moved to more reliable and frequent source of data. For postsecondary-level measurement, better matched data to indicator.
- **Indicator 3.1 Secondary Student Outcomes** – Added data on postsecondary outcomes of special populations to reflect disaggregation requirements in new law.
- **Indicator 3.2 Postsecondary Student Outcomes** – Data provided in last year's plan did not reflect outcomes for students in postsecondary vocational education. The shift to a new source of data (BPS) was made to more accurately match data with the indicator.

Dropped

- **4.1 Indicator Performance Measurement** – All states are required to implement standards and measures as the basis for their accountability systems under the 1998 Perkins Act, making the original indicator and measures meaningless. Measures of state performance reporting are being incorporated into other indicators.
- **5.1 Indicator Student-Teacher Ratio** – Great variation in the design and delivery of vocational education programs makes this indicator not only difficult to measure but also questionable in the value added to program improvement at the Federal level.

New—None.

602

603

NATIONAL PROGRAMS (PERKINS VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT)

Goal: Increase access to and improve education programs that strengthen educational achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: All these objectives are designed to improve the quality, usefulness, and accessibility of projects funded by our National Programs budget. Projects have been prioritized according to program objectives and the Department's Strategic Plan Objective 1.2, which states, "Schools help all students make successful transitions to college and careers."

FY 2000—$17,500,000

FY 2001—$17,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASE THE USE OF RESEARCH FINDINGS TO INFORM PROGRAM DIRECTION AND TO IMPROVE STATE AND LOCAL PRACTICE.

Indicator 1.1 Disseminate quality research: By 2001, the number of customers using the products and services of the National Centers for Research and Dissemination in Vocational Education* will increase to 38,000.

*Note: In accordance with the newly enacted Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, cooperative agreements for two new National Centers were awarded in 1999. The new centers were fully operational by January 1, 2000.

Targets and Performance Data

Customers requesting information and/or resources from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets*
	Electronic	Print	Total	
1998:	31,000	3,127	34,127	
1999:	**36,000**	**3,157**	**39,157**	**36,000**
2000:				36,000
2001:				38,000

***Note:** Performance targets for 2000 and 2001 are based on actual performance data from the previously funded National Center. During the transition year to the new centers, it is expected that the new centers will achieve at least the same minimum level of customer satisfaction as the previous center. Should the new center greatly exceed or fall below this level, performance targets for 2000 and 2001 will be adjusted for future GPRA reporting.

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded.

Explanation: Performance is likely to continue to increase. Beginning in 2000, the Department will increase emphasis on both the development of practitioner-oriented products and services and the dissemination function of the newly funded centers. For the new centers, funds will be split 50/50 for research and dissemination. The previous centers split funds 60/40, with slightly more funds being allocated for research.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: NCRVE Reports.
Frequency: Quarterly.
Next Update: 2000 (for 1999 data).

Validation Procedures: Data collection processes were developed before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

604

605

Indicator 1.2 Promote quality research: By 2001, the percentage of customers who are "very satisfied" with products and services received from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education will increase to 85 percent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Customers responding to a customer satisfaction survey indicated that they were "very satisfied" with the products and services received from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education			**Status:** It is likely that performance targets for 2000-2001 will be met.	**Source:** Customer Satisfaction Survey. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Performance targets are likely to be met, given the Department's heightened emphasis on both the development of practitioner-oriented products and services and the dissemination function of the newly funded centers. For the new centers, funds will be split 50/50 for research and dissemination. The previous centers split funds 60/40, with slightly more funds being allocated for research.	**Validation Procedure:** Data collection processes were developed before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed.
1998:	81%			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**83%**		
2000:		83%		
2001:		85%		
***Note:** See note on performance targets under 1.1 above.				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This survey is voluntary and, to date, has reflected the perceptions of only half (53 percent) of the total number of customers that receive National Center for Research in Vocational Education products and services. Strategies are being considered to improve response rates.

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE AND EXPAND THE USE OF EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES THAT PROMOTE SECONDARY AND POSTSECONDARY REFORMS.

Indicator 2.1 Identify New American High Schools: By 2001, 200 high schools will receive Department recognition for implementing New American High School strategies that combine career and academic preparation—often in smaller learning environments—to prepare all students for college and careers.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of schools having received Department recognition for fully adopting New American High School strategies			**Status:** Although the performance target for 1999 was not met, it is likely that the performance targets for 2000-2001 will be met.	**Source:** New American High School application tracking documents. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** The 1999 performance target was not met because fewer applications than expected were received from schools for the New American High School recognition, probably because the application process coincided with end-of-school-year testing and related activities. The timing of the application process has been adjusted, which should greatly increase the number of applications received and, thus, the number of schools eligible to receive the New American High School recognition.	**Validation Procedure:** Data collection processes were developed before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed.
1996:	10			
1998:	17			
1999:	**30**	**100**		
2000:		150		
2001:		200		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

606

607

Indicator 2.2 Promote New American High School strategies: By 2001, 2,500 high schools will be working toward implementing New American High School strategies. Implementation is defined as working with a high school reform network to implement one or more New American High School strategies.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of schools working with three high school reform networks			**Status:** It is likely that performance targets for 2000-2001 will be met.	**Source:** Grantee reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**1,500**	**See note below**		
2000:		2,000	**Explanation:** Performance targets are likely to be met, given the Department's investment in providing technical assistance and resources through reform networks to help high schools implement New American High School strategies and, ultimately, prepare successful applications for the New American High School recognition.	**Validation Procedures:** Data collection processes were developed before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed.
2001:		2,500		
Note: The Department first began working with reform networks in 1999 as a strategy to help high schools implement New American High School initiatives. Therefore, the first year to collect baseline data was 1999. Accordingly, performance targets are set beginning in 2000.				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

Indicator 2.3 Promote professional development: By 2001, 3,000 prospective and current teachers will be trained to teach academic and technical coursework in the context of real-life applications and careers (hereafter referred to as contextual teaching and learning).

Targets and Performance Date			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of prospective and current teachers trained to implement contextual teaching and learning approaches			**Status:** It is likely that performance targets will be met.	**Source:** Contractor Progress Reports *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (for 2000 data).
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**750**	**See note below**		
2000:		1,800	**Explanation:** Performance targets are likely to be met, given the Department's priority to provide technical assistance and resources to help teachers implement contextual teaching and learning approaches. The Department also will begin sharing with all states the resources developed by the contractors, so that many more teachers will be trained to implement contextual teaching and learning approaches.	**Validation Procedures:** Data collection processes were developed before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed.
2001:		3,000		
Note: The Department first awarded contracts in 1998 to seven universities to train prospective and current teachers on contextual teaching and learning approaches. Therefore, the first year to collect baseline data was 1999. Accordingly, performance targets are set beginning in 2000.				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Providing leadership and support for national research to improve the quality of vocational, adult, and workforce education.
- Disseminating research-based strategies that promote education reform at secondary and postsecondary levels.
- Training prospective and current teachers to implement contextual teaching and learning approaches that enable students to understand real-life applications of their academic and technical coursework.
- Partnering with firmly established and experienced reform networks to help high schools implement New American High School strategies that help all students prepare for college and careers.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Promoting the development and dissemination of practitioner-oriented products and services through the newly funded centers.

How This Program Coordinates with Other Federal Activities

- To establish its research agenda, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) collaborates with the National School-to-Work Office, the Office of the Under Secretary's Planning and Evaluation Service, the Office of Education Research and Improvement, and the National Center for Education Statistics.
- To conduct research and dissemination, the National Centers are expected to coordinate efforts with the National School-to-Work Office and the Office of Education Research and Improvement's Research Labs and Centers.
- To implement the New American High School initiative, OVAE collaborates with the Department's Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Programs, Blue Ribbon Schools Initiative, Parents and Families in Education Initiative, and Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Communities Initiative.
- To provide professional development on contextual teaching and learning approaches, OVAE works with the Office of Education Research and Improvement's Postsecondary Institute and the Department-wide Professional Development Team.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- Realigning previously funded activities with requirements of the newly enacted legislation to ensure that its full intent is achieved.
- Achieving scale in efforts such as New American High School and professional development so that all schools and teachers have access to state-of-the-art instructional approaches and all students are provided with research-based learning strategies.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 (two years old)

Adjusted

- Objective 1 was renumbered as this year's Objective 2.
- Objective 2 was renumbered as this year's Objective 1.
- Indicator 2.1 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 1.2.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.1 was dropped, as it was determined to be a system output measure rather than a student outcome measure.
- Objective 3 and Indicator 3.1 were dropped, as they were determined to be system output measures rather than student outcome measures.

From FY 2000 (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 1.2, and the language was strengthened to focus more on customer satisfaction with products and services received.
- Objective 3 was renumbered as this year's Objective 2.
- Indicator 3.1 was divided into this year's Indicators 2.1 and 2.2 for ease and clarity in annual reporting on actual performance.
- Indicator 3.2 was renumbered as this year's Indicator 2.3.

Dropped

- Objective 2 was dropped, as it was determined to be captured in last year's—and this year's—Objective 1.
- Indicator 2.1 was dropped, as it was determined to be a system output measure rather than a student outcome measure.
- Indicator 2.3 was dropped, as it was determined to be a system output measure rather than a student outcome measure.

New

- Indicator 1.1 was added to provide another indicator and gauge of customer use of national research findings.

TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Goal: To increase access to and improve vocational education that will strengthen workforce preparation, employment opportunities, and lifelong learning in the Indian Community.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Program objectives relate to the Department's Strategic Plan Objective 1.2, which states, "Schools help all students make successful transitions to college and careers."

FY 2000—$4,600,000

FY 2001—$4,600,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT VOCATIONAL STUDENTS SERVED IN TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS MAKE SUCCESSFUL TRANSITIONS TO WORK OR CONTINUING EDUCATION.

Indicator 1.1 Postsecondary outcomes: By Fall 2001, 27% of vocational students will receive an AA degree or certificate.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Vocational students earning an AA degree or certificate			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Insufficient data are available at this time to assess progress toward meeting performance targets.	**Source:** Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Performance Reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data collection processes were developed before ED standards for evaluating the quality of program performance data were developed. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are based on students in continuous enrollment. Calculations of completion, therefore, are based on an ever-changing number of students enrolled, rather than a single cohort. Planned improvements for data collection include investigating whether a single cohort of students can be selected and tracked to more effectively calculate completions over time.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1999:	**23%**	**Baseline**		
FY 2000:		25%		
FY 2001:		27%		
Note: Baseline data first became available in 1999. Therefore, performance targets are set beginning in 2000.				

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Working with grantees to improve their data collection systems.
- Collaborating with the Office of the White House Initiative for Tribal Colleges and Universities to develop additional strategies.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Supporting grantees' efforts to introduce new, high-interest vocational areas.
- Supporting grantees' implementation of expanded professional development activities.
- Supporting grantees' plans to enhance student recruitment, enrollment, retention, and completion.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Efforts under this initiative are coordinated with the White House Initiative for Tribal Colleges and Universities, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Department of Education's Native American Programs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Lack of clearly defined plans by institutions for increasing student recruitment.
- Lack of sufficient supportive services at institutions to alleviate barriers to student retention.
- Lack of relevant curricula areas and instructional approaches to retain current and attract new students.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1 is renumbered as this year's Indicator 1.1.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.1 was dropped pending identification of a valid and reliable data source.
- Objective 2, Indicator 2.2, and Indicator 2.3 were dropped, as they are system output measures rather than student outcome measures.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1 was dropped pending identification of a valid and reliable data source.

Dropped

- Indicator 1 and Indicator 1.2 were dropped, as they are system output measures rather than student outcome measures.
- Objective 2 is renumbered as this year's Objective 1.

New—None.

614

615

ADULT EDUCATION: STATE GRANTS AND KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT

Goal: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The primary link is with Goal 3 of the Department's Strategic Plan (ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning). The adult education objectives are focused on increasing access to and improving the overall quality of adult education and literacy services nationwide. In addition, strategies related to family literacy – such as the development of a family literacy distance learning project – are being implemented in support of Goal 2 (build a solid foundation for learning for all children).

FY 2000—$464,000,000

FY 2001—$549,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE LITERACY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Indicator 1.1 Improve literacy: By 2002, the percentage of adults performing in the lowest proficiency level in the National Adult Literacy Survey will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of adults estimated to be in the lowest of five proficiency levels in the 1992 National Adult Literacy Survey:			**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** This indicator is built around a national household adult literacy survey conducted every 10 years. The initial survey benchmarking adult literacy proficiency in the United States was conducted in 1992. The second national survey, which will provide comparative data on the literacy proficiencies of adults, is scheduled for 2002. No interim data are available.	**Source:** National Adult Literacy Survey I, 1992; National Assessment of Adult Literacy Skills, 2002. *Frequency:* Every 10 years. *Next Update:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data validated by National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics Statistical Standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Limited background information collected on adults in the sample limited the scope of analyses. National Assessment of Adult Literacy Skills-2002 will expand the background questionnaires to provide additional descriptive information and contextual information to enhance the overall analyses of the data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1992:	21% - 23%			
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Continuing decrease		
2001:		Continuing decrease		
2002:		Continuing decrease		

OBJECTIVE 2: PROVIDE ADULT LEARNERS WITH OPPORTUNITIES TO ACQUIRE BASIC FOUNDATION SKILLS (INCLUDING ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION), COMPLETE SECONDARY EDUCATION, AND TRANSITION TO FURTHER EDUCATION AND TRAINING AND TO WORK.

Indicator 2.1 Basic skill acquisition: By 2000, 40 percent of adults in beginning-level Adult Basic Education programs will complete that level and achieve basic skill proficiency.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The performance data reflect the percentage of low literate adults (enrolled in beginning level basic education) who demonstrated a level of educational progress needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels are arranged in a hierarchy from beginning literacy through high school completion. The variance in completion rates is based, in part, on changes in assessment procedures at the local program and classroom level.	**Source:** Adult Education Management Information System. *Frequency:* Annual Report. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Department of Education attestation process and the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data verified the 1998 data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education must rely on states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will implement new data collection and reporting protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. Also the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will create a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
1996:	27%			
1997:	40%			
1998:	31%			
1999:	**No data available**	**Increase**		
2000:		40%		
2001:		40%		

Indicator 2.2 Basic English language acquisition: By 2002, 40 percent of adults in beginning English for Speakers of Other Languages programs will complete that level.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The performance data reflect the percentage of beginning level English Literacy learners (adults with minimal or no English language skills) who demonstrated a level of English language proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level.	**Source:** Adult Education Management Information System. *Frequency:* Annual Report. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** The 1998 data were verified by Department of Education attestation process and the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
1996:	30%			
1997:	28%			
1998:	28%			
1999:	**No data available**	**Increase**		
2000:		40%		
2001:		40%		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Educational functioning levels are arranged in a hierarchy from beginning-level English Literacy through advanced-level English Literacy.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will implement new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. Also, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will develop a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Indicator 2.3 Secondary completion: By 2000, 40 percent of adults enrolled in secondary level programs will earn a diploma or GED credential.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Adult Education Management Information System.
1996:	36%			*Frequency:* Annual Report.
1997:	37%			*Next Update:* 2000.
1998:	33%		**Explanation:** The performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners enrolled in secondary level programs of instruction who earned their high school diploma or GED credential within the reporting period. Lack of sustained follow-up processes to collect these data has led to inconsistent reporting and underreporting for this indicator.	
1999:	**No data available**	**Increase**		**Validation Procedure:** The 1998 data were verified by Department of Education attestation process and the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
2000:		40%		
2001:		40%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will implement new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. Also, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will develop a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indicator 2.4 Transition to further education and training: By 2000, 300,000 adults participating in adult education will enroll in further academic education or vocational training.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The performance data reflect the total number of adult learners who, upon exit from adult education, enrolled in a postsecondary education or training program. Lack of sustained follow-up processes to collect these data has led to inconsistent reporting and underreporting for this indicator.	**Source:** Adult Education Management Information System. *Frequency:* Annual Report. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will implement new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. Also, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will develop a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
1996:	175,255			
1997:	178,520			
1998:	158,167			
1999:	**No data available**	**Increase**		
2000:		300,000		
2001:		300,000		

Indicator 2.5 Transition to work: By 2000, 300,000 adults participating in adult education will get a job or retain or advance in their current job.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The performance data reflect the total number of adult learners who, upon exit from adult education, obtained a job, retained their current job, or were promoted on the job. Lack of sustained follow-up processes to collect these data has led to inconsistent and underreporting for this indicator.	**Source:** Adult Education Management Information System. *Frequency:* Annual Report. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.
1996:	306,982			
1997:	340,206			
1998:	294,755			
1999:	**No data available**	**Increase**		
2000:		300,000		
2001:		300,000		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will implement new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. Also, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will develop a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

OBJECTIVE 3: PROVIDE ADULT LEARNERS AT THE LOWEST LEVELS OF LITERACY ACCESS TO EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPROVE THEIR BASIC FOUNDATION SKILLS.

Indicator 3.1 Educationally disadvantaged: By 2000, adults at the lowest levels of literacy (those in Beginning Adult Basic Education and Beginning English Literacy) will comprise 45-50 percent of the total national enrollment.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Adult Education Management Information System, 1999.
1996:	44%			*Frequency:* Annual Report.
1997:	45%			*Next Update:* 2000.
1998:	49%		**Explanation:** The most educationally disadvantaged adults (those at the lowest levels of literacy and English language skills) have traditionally been a target for services. These performance data demonstrate that almost one-half of all adults served in the program are those adults with the most demonstrated need of educational services.	
1999:	**No data available**	**Continuing increase**		**Validation Procedure:** Data collected before the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings.
2000:		50%		
2001:		50%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** As a third tier recipient of this data, theOffice of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will implement new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. Also, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will develop a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To broaden access to high-quality adult programs, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education has implemented a long-term technology initiative to extend access to adult education and literacy services to adult learners within their homes, workplaces, and communities; make high-quality instruction available through a variety of modalities, including distance learning; and increase access to staff development through the expanded use of technology.
- To address the quality of instruction for low-level adult basic education and English as a second language program, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will continue studies of "what works" in adult basic education and English as a second language program to improve the quality of services.
- In order to broaden available adult services, especially to rural localities, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will support the development of public/private collaborative projects, such as a technology-based distance learning family literacy project that will provide services via public television.
- To address the needs of adults with the lowest literacy skills, many with learning disabilities, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will continue to support a multiyear project in one-stop employment centers to demonstrate model student assessments to screen adults for learning disabilities.
- To support the professionalization of adult instructors, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education has entered into a partnership with states to develop model professional teaching standards and provide technical assistance in system improvement.
- To improve program performance, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will continue its collaborative partnership with the National Center for Family Literacy and Even Start to develop state-level alliances that support coordinated family literacy services.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To address performance accountability in adult education, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will support the implementation of a national reporting system that meets the performance accountability requirements for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and serves as the primary data source for the national incentive award program under the Workforce Investment Act, and adult education's Government Performance and Review Act indicators.
- To expand access to high-quality English literacy programs linked to civics and life skills instruction, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will implement a $7 million discretionary grant program to demonstrate effective outreach and instructional strategies to provide English as second language and civics skills to immigrants.
- To expand access and use of technology among adults, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will support the implementation and evaluation of the $10 million Community Technology Centers discretionary grant program. The program is designed to create model programs that demonstrate the effectiveness of technology in urban and rural areas and economically distressed communities.
- Support the design and implementation of a national evaluation or set of studies designed to support the next reauthorization of the adult education program.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- In providing leadership and technical assistance to states to further the goals of the Workforce Investment Act, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education is working with the Department of Labor to implement Titles I, II, and V of the Act. Joint activities include joint development of policy and regulations governing implementation issues, joint development of unified state plan guidance, joint review of unified state plan submission, joint development of common definitions to be used in Title I and Title II performance management systems, joint development of the national incentive award program, and joint training of state and local constituencies.
- To support the Office of Vocational and Adult Education's interest in literacy and transition services for incarcerated young adults, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will form a partnership with the Department of Justice and the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services to create a national research center. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education will support research concerning juvenile offenders with learning disabilities.
- The development of new technologies across the globe raises both opportunities and challenges. These new technologies will continue to provide unprecedented economic and educational advantages for some countries, while for other countries technology only widens the chasm between the "haves" and 'have-nots." The Office of Vocational and Adult Education, in partnership with the Organization for Economic Opportunity and Development, will cosponsor an international roundtable on lifelong learning and new technology.
- To promote the use of effective instructional practices in workplace literacy, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education will partner with the Department of Labor and the Center for the Study of Work at the University of Wisconsin to cosponsor a national workshop on workplace literacy learning.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The primary challenge is to build program capacity to provide quality services to large and diverse target population. Currently, the program serves between 8 and 10 percent of the target population.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999) Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 3.3 was dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicators 3.2 (distance learning), 4.1 (building performance management capacity), 5.1 (high teaching standards), 5.2 (professional development), 6.1 (family literacy), 6.2 (employment training policy), and 7.1 (customer satisfaction). These indicators are being retained internally to track management activities in the Division o f Adult Education and Literacy.

New—None.

STATE GRANTS FOR INCARCERATED YOUTH OFFENDERS

Goal: To increase access to and achievement in correctional education programs that will aid in the reintegration of prisoners into their communities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The activities of the State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders Program support Objectives 3.4 (lifelong learning) and 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services).
FY 2000—$14,000,000
FY 2001—$12,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: GRANTEES WILL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT IMPROVED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT INCLUDE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

Indicator 1.1 Improved vocational and academic achievement: By Fall 2000, 75 percent of students participating in vocational and academic programs will complete their annual program curriculum.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No data are available at this time to assess progress toward meeting performance targets. **Explanation:** Congress first enacted this program – and the Department first awarded state grants - in 1998. Performance data will be available in spring 2000.	**Source:** Grantee evaluation reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Spring 2000. **Validation Procedure:** The Department will validate data through the use of National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and Statistical Standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No data limitations are noted.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		75%		
2001:		85%		

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND JOB PLACEMENT PROGRAMS FOR INCARCERATED PERSONS TO HELP OFFENDERS REINTEGRATE INTO THEIR COMMUNITIES AFTER RELEASE.

Indicator 2.1 Increased employment rates following release: By Fall 2001, 50 percent of participants will be employed upon their release.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No data are available at this time to assess progress toward meeting performance targets. **Explanation:** Performance data will be available in spring 2001. Performance targets will be set beginning in fall 2001.	**Source:** Grantee evaluation reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Spring 2001. **Validation Procedure:** The Department will validate data through the use of National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and Statistical Standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** No data limitations are noted.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		50%		

631

Indicator 2.2 Improved recidivism rates: By Fall 2002, recidivism rates for participants will be 10 percent lower than for a comparison group.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No data are available at this time to assess progress toward meeting performance targets. **Explanation:** This study will include data on a sub-sample of correctional education participants who meet minimum eligibility requirements for this state grant program. Given varying release dates, as well as ample time to gather recidivism data – for at least one year after release - performance data will be available in spring 2002. Given the first availability of performance data in spring 2002, performance targets will be set beginning in fall 2002.	**Source:** Grantee Evaluation Reports. Correctional Education Association Recidivism Study. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Spring 2002. **Validation Procedure:** The Department will validate data through the use of National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and Statistical Standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This study will not be able to track the recidivism of all students who participate in correctional education programs funded through this state grant program.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		No target set		
2002:		10%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- With limited information available to grantees concerning effective correctional education approaches, the program will continue developing a network among grantees to exchange information on promising correctional education strategies.
- As a result of difficulties grantees encounter in the area of data collection, the program will continue assisting state grantees to improve their data collection systems, beginning with the initial compilation of baseline information on student's participation and completion rates.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To address the need of grantees to identify relevant education and job training information, the program is helping grantees to locate appropriate regional information on postsecondary education and job placement programs for students after their release.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- In an effort to identify promising approaches and to strengthen technical assistance efforts in correctional education and job training and placement programs, the Office of Correctional Education participates in the interagency Coordinating Council on Correctional Education with representatives from within the Department, such as Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Office of Postsecondary Education, and the Office of Legislative and Congressional Affairs and other Federal agencies, including the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Labor.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Given the recent enactment of this program and unavailability of data to assess progress to date, no challenges are noted at this time.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- **Improved participation in post-release assistance programs (1.2).** This indicator was dropped due to a lack of a reliable and consistent instrument to collect data across states.
- **Improved participation in GED programs (2.1).** This indicator was dropped because a GED is a prerequisite for participation in the program.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- All indicators have been adjusted to include numerical performance targets.
- **Improved recidivism rates (1.3)** was moved to be more appropriately placed under Objective 2, which addresses reintegration of individuals into their communities after their release.
- **Improved academic and vocational achievement (1.2).** By fall 2000, student achievement scores on testing measures will improve and the number of students obtaining vocational skill certificates will increase.
- **Increased participation in job placement programs and improved job retention rates (2.1).** By fall 2000, the rate of students obtaining jobs and retaining jobs will be higher than those of comparison groups. This indicator was modified to lessen the emphasis on the outcome of placement in programs and heighten the emphasis on the more direct outcome of obtaining employment.

Dropped

- **Improved completion rates (1.1).** Although an increase in the number of students completing educational programs remains a high priority, this indicator was dropped due to a lack of a reliable and consistent instrument to collect data across states.
- **Improved access to information on postsecondary education programs and job placement programs (2.2).** External peer reviews/customer satisfaction surveys of Office of Correctional Education technical support and mail response will show increasing satisfaction with quality of information provided. Although customer satisfaction with Office of Correctional Education products and services remains a high priority, this indicator was dropped due to the lack of a reliable and consistent instrument to collect data across states. Data from multiple sources will be tracked internally to assess progress in meeting this indicator.

New—None.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY

Goal: To provide the adult education and literacy field with the knowledge, resources, and infrastructure necessary to improve the quality of literacy instruction and the achievement of learners.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Program objectives are in support of the Department's Strategic Plan Objective 3.4, which is to ensure that all adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earnings power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.

FY 2000—$6,000,000

FY 2001—$6,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE LITERACY INSTRUCTORS, STUDENTS, AND ADMINISTRATORS WITH AN INTERNET-BASED, STATE-OF-THE-ART INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM—THE LITERACY INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM (LINCS)—THAT IMPROVES THE QUALITY AND INCREASES THE AVAILABILITY OF LITERACY SERVICES.

Indicator 1.1 Improving quality: The percentage of LINCS users judging its information and communications resources useful in improving the quality and availability of literacy services will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Data are currently being collected for reporting next year.	**Source:** On-line survey of LINCS users.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		*Frequency:* Ongoing.
FY 2000:		Baseline		*Next Update:* December 2000.
FY 2001:		Increase over baseline	**Explanation:** Because of feedback on the need for significant changes in LINCS, the site was completely overhauled in 1999. The new site, including many new and improved features, went on-line in October 1999. The new evaluation form was added in November 1999.	**Validation Procedures:** None.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 1.2 Expanding use of technology: The number of instructors trained to use LINCS will increase by 20 percent over the baseline year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** 1999 target for training was exceeded.	**Source:** Enrollment data at LINCS training, 1999.
FY 1998:	4,900			*Frequency:* Reported to NIFL quarterly.
FY 1999:	**6,000**	**5,880**	**Explanation:** In FY 1999, 60,000 instructors received the performance target set for 5,880 instructors.	*Next Update:* December 2000.
FY 2000:		5,880		**Validation Procedures:** None.
FY 2001:		5,880		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

636

637

Indicator 1.3 Technology in the classroom: By 2000, of those trained through LINCS, 40 percent will report an expanded use of technology and improvement in the quality of instruction.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Followup survey not implemented as of December 1999. **Explanation:** NIFL resources were directed to the redesign and upgrading of LINCS in 1999. Funds have been approved in 1999-00 spending plan to support contract for LINCS followup survey.	**Source:** Followup survey of a sample of instructors trained to use LINCS. *Frequency:* Semiannually. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		40%		
FY 2001:		40%		

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION FOR ADULTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES, ESPECIALLY IN THE AREA OF READING.

Indicator 2.1 Improving instruction for learning-disabled adults: By 2000, 70 percent of individuals trained in the use of Bridges to Practice, a set of guidebooks for identifying and serving adults with LD, will report satisfaction with it as a means of improving services and the quality of instruction for LD adults.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Data have been collected from participants in training, but analysis of the data has not been completed in time to be included in this form. We hope to be able to report the results of the surveys by March 2000. **Explanation:** Initiation of training on Bridges to Practice was delayed. This has caused a delay in data collection and analysis.	**Source:** Survey of training participants. *Frequency:* Ongoing with training. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		70%		
FY 2001:		70%		

Indicator 2.2 Training teachers for better reading instruction: The number of teachers trained to use a research-based reading approach will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Our original plan, as reflected in last year's indicators, was for data collection not to occur until next year (2000). Data would have been available to report December 2000. Now that we are starting to move forward with the work, we believe the development phase will extend through 2000, and data on use and impact will not be available until 2001. **Explanation:** None.	**Source:** Data from pilot programs and subsequent surveys on the extent of use of the approaches. *Frequency:* N/A. *Next Update:* Data will first be collected in 2001. **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		No target set		
FY 2001:		Baseline		

639

639

OBJECTIVE 3: EQUIPPED FOR THE FUTURE SYSTEM REFORM PROJECT. DEVELOP CONTENT STANDARDS, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, AND ASSESSMENTS THAT WILL IMPROVE LITERACY ABILITIES IN A BROAD ARRAY OF SKILL AREAS.

Indicator 3.1 Expanding the number of practitioners trained to use the EFF standards: The number of teachers trained to use EFF will increase over the baseline by 10 percent each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** As originally proposed, the baseline year of data on EFF training will be available in December 2000. **Explanation:** EFF training began in September 1999. Thus the baseline period for this indicator will be September 1999 through September 2000.	**Source:** Data on the number of practitioners who receive EFF training. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Sep. 2000 (baseline) **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		Baseline		
FY 2001:		Baseline plus 10%		

Indicator 3.2 Improving instruction of adult learners: Seventy percent of practitioners who have received more than the introductory training in using the Equipped for the Future framework and standards will report satisfaction with them as a means of providing more effective instruction to adults who come to their programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** As originally proposed, these data will be reported in next year's plan. **Explanation:** EFF training began in September 1999. Thus the data collection period for this indicator will be September 1999 through September 2000. These data will be reported in next year's plan.	**Source:** Practitioners trained to use EFF. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 2000 (baseline). **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		70%		
FY 2001:		70%		

OBJECTIVE 4: INCREASE AWARENESS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF LITERACY SERVICES AND THE NEED FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SUPPORT FOR LITERACY EFFORTS.

Indicator 4.1 Recruitment and program support: The number of youth and young adult literacy volunteers (ages 16-24) will increase 20 percent in the 15 cities participating in the NIFL literacy promotion activities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Baseline of youth and young adult volunteers in the 15 cities			**Status:** Materials development and training for the campaign has been ongoing. Radio PSAs began in all 15 cities in November 1999, and other materials will be available January 2000. **Explanation:** Campaign kickoff has been delayed by several months, partially because more cities wished to participate. Data from the cities will now be collected between January 2000 and September 2000.	**Source:** Reports from each of the 15 cities to the National Alliance of Urban Literacy Coalitions (NAULC), with funding from the NIFL, will work with the cities to receive the data and report to the NIFL. *Frequency:* This will be a one-time effort lasting from January 2000 through September 2000. *Next Update:* December 2000 **Validation Procedures:** None. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1999:	**1,121**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		1,345		
FY 2001:				

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Continue to build a high-quality data base of materials and communications opportunities that directly and indirectly support the improvement and growth of literacy services in the Nation. Provide training to individuals at the state and local program level.
- Use recent research on reading instruction to develop and test a model of effective reading instruction for adults that can be incorporated into literacy programs nationwide.
- Link ongoing effort to improve instruction for adults with learning disabilities with a new reading project to begin in the summer of 1999.
- Fund state and local literacy professionals and work with commercial publishers to create materials and assessments that lead to achievement of EFF standards. Support pilot program sites in using and assessing EFF products.
- Create public awareness opportunities in the media and through other mechanisms that increase awareness about the availability of literacy services and the need for increased support.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The NIFL is unique in that it is administered by an Interagency Group made up of the Secretaries of Education, Labor, and HHS. We have worked extensively with Education and Labor and somewhat with HHS. For example, we are working closely with DOL to integrate our LINCS project with their America's Learning Exchange (ALX) initiative. Our data base of literacy providers will be an integral part of ALX's data base of education and training providers. We have been working with ED throughout development of the EFF standards to ensure that states and local programs can use them to meet the Federal reporting requirements of WIA. These are just two examples of how we work with other Federal agencies and programs on all of our major activities.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The mission of the NIFL, as defined by our legislation, is to help build the infrastructure of the adult and family literacy field. We do this through a variety of communications and information, research and development, and collaboration-building initiatives. The NIFL does not provide direct educational services to students. In addition, the NIFL is a very small Federal agency ($6 million for program and S&E). This combination of being primarily a service provider to practitioners/policymakers and being small creates a challenge to meeting the goals of GPRA, which appears to be designed for programs, such as Title I, that can report learning gains for students served by Federal programs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (2 years ago)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New

- Several indicators were modified to provide a clearer sense of how improvement and success will be measured. For example, Indicator 1.1 was changed from a general statement about user satisfaction to a goal of making annual improvements in the percentage of users reporting satisfaction with LINCS's content.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HIGHER EDUCATION

AID FOR INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT, TITLES III AND V

Part A (Strengthening Institutions), Part A, sec.316 (American Indian Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities), Part A, sec.317 (Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions), Part B (Historically Black Colleges and Universities [HBCUs] and Historically Black Graduate Institutions), Part D (HBCU Capital Financing), Part E (Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program), and Part V (Developing Hispanic-serving Institutions)

Goal: To assist institutions that have limited resources and that traditionally serve large numbers of low-income and minority students to continue to serve these students, and to improve the capacity of these institutions to provide ongoing, up-to-date quality education in all areas of higher education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Title III Program supports the Department's overall goal of ensuring access and equity and enabling all students to achieve academic excellence. More specifically, Title III supports Objectives 3.1 (successful preparation for postsecondary education) and 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by serving large numbers of low-income and minority students for whom postsecondary access, retention, and degree attainment have been elusive.

FY 2000—$300,750,000

FY 2001—$357,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE THE ACADEMIC QUALITY OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Specialized accreditation: The percentage of Title III institutions having specialized accreditation, a measure of academic program quality, will be maintained or increased.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of Title III institutions having a specialized accreditation

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998-99:	**66%**	**No target set**
1999-00:		No target set
2000-01:		Maintain or increase level
2001-02:		Maintain or increase level

Assessment of Progress

Status: Progress cannot be judged until trend data are available.

Explanation: In the 1998-99 school year, 66 percent of Title III institutions had received at least one specialized accreditation. Specialized accreditations are an indication that the quality of an academic program is sufficiently high to meet the rigorous standards imposed by an independent agency.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: 1999 Higher Education Directory.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedures: Data are verified by the publisher by comparing against lists maintained by all accrediting agencies recognized by the Department of Education.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 1.2 Graduation rates: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in Title III 4-year and 2-year colleges will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of full-time, degree-seeking students at Title III institutions completing a 4-year degree within 6 years and a 2-year degree, certificate, or transferring to a 4-year school within 3 years

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	4- Year	2- Year	
1997:	34%	22%	
1999:	**Data not available**		**Continuing increase in rate**
2000:			Continuing increase in rate
2001:			Continuing increase in rate

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data are available; progress cannot be judged until trend data are available.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) conducted as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Student Aid Study (IPEDS).
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Verified by ED data attestation process.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Explanation: Approximately one-third of full-time degree-seeking students complete a 4-year degree within 6 years and one-fifth complete a 2-year degree, certificate, or transfer to a 4-year school within 3 years. These data only measure the extent to which students complete their degrees at the Title III institution they first attended. Therefore, the rates are understated to the extent to which students complete their degree at a different institution.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Postsecondary institutions are not required to report graduation rates until 2002 (1999 for 2-year institutions). However, data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of 4-year students at Title III institutions and 73 percent of 2-year students at Title III institutions.

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE THE FISCAL STABILITY OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 2.1 Fiscal balance: Over 90 percent of Title III institutions will maintain a positive fiscal balance.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of Title III institutions having a positive fiscal balance				**Status:** No 1999 data are available; progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Finance Survey conducted as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Student Aid Study (IPEDS).
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
	All Institutions	Public Institutions		**Explanation:** Among all Title III institutions, 92 percent had a positive fiscal balance in the 1995-96 school year. The percentage of public Title III institutions having a positive fiscal balance declined slightly from 92 percent in 1995-96 to 90 percent in 1996-97.	*Next Update:* 1996-97 data for private institutions and 1997-98 data for all institutions will be available in 2000.
1995-96:	92%	92%			
1996-97:	N/A	90%			**Validation Procedures:** Data validated by NCES review and NCES Statistical Standards.
1997-98:	Data not available				
1998-99:	**Data not available**		**90%**		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data tend to be several years old. NCES is planning on instituting a Web-based data collection for IPEDS that should dramatically reduce the time required for information to be available.
1999-00:			90%		
2000-01:			90%		

Indicator 2.2 Endowment: The percentage of Title III institutions having an endowment will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of Title III institutions having a positive endowment				**Status**: No 1999 data are available; progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Finance Survey conducted as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Student Aid Study (IPEDS).
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
	All institutions	Public institutions		**Explanation**: Among all Title III institutions, 57 percent had a positive endowment in the 1995-96 school year. The percentage of public Title III institutions having a positive endowment increased from 51 percent in 1995-96 to 56 percent in 1996-97.	*Next Update:* 1996-97 data for private institutions and 1997-98 data for all institutions will be available in 2000.
1995-96:	57%	51%			
1996-97:	N/A	56%			**Validation Procedures**: Data validated by NCES review and NCES Statistical Standards.
1997-98:	Data not available				
1998-99:	**Data not available**		**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:			Continuing increase		
2000-01:			Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data tend to be several years old. NCES is planning on instituting a Web-based data collection for IPEDS that should dramatically reduce the time required for information to be available.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Assist Title III institutions in serving low-income and minority students by disseminating information to institutions on effective practices.
- Establish a formal mechanism for exchange of information with Title III-related organizations and higher education agencies and associations.
- Conduct consistent, thorough reviews of performance reports with feedback to grantees.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Develop a listserv for obtaining grantee feedback on performance indicators.
- Address the lack of program data on specific outcomes of grantee activities, identify and collect measures of the impact of Title III funds on institutions. In addition, identify and collect data on specific outcomes related to the various component programs that make up the Title III Program.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Program works with the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans, and Tribal Colleges to coordinate assistance being provided across the Federal government to these institutions.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The Inspector General (IG) is expected to release a report on the Title III programs shortly. Once the report has been received, a plan for addressing the IG's concerns will be developed.
- Title III funds are given to institutions in order to meet specific needs identified in their Comprehensive Development Plan. This flexibility greatly increases the usefulness of the program for institutions but makes it difficult to identify common goals and indicators that apply to all schools.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.2 was modified to replace institutional persistence rates with the IPEDS GRS data in order to reduce burden on schools since they already have or will have to report the IPEDS data. Also, the IPEDS data are likely to be much more uniform since they have standard definitions.
- Indicator 2.2 was modified to replace institutional endowment information with the IPEDS Finance data in order to reduce burden on schools since they already have to report the IPEDS data. Also, the IPEDS data are likely to be much more uniform since they have standard definitions.

Dropped

- The remaining indicators were dropped for three reasons. Two-year-old Indicators 1.1, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, and 6.1 were dropped because there was no data collection plan in place to obtain the needed information and were replaced by indicators based on ongoing national data collection systems. Two-year-old Indicators 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, and all the indicators listed under management improvement were dropped because these are internal indicators needed to operate and manage the program but are not suitable for reporting the outcomes of the program to external constituents. The remainder of the indicators are related to the specific component programs of the Title II Program and were dropped in favor of uniform measures across the Title III Program.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.2 was modified to reflect more current information available from audited financial statements related to the fiscal strength of institutions.
- Indicator 3.2 was modified to replace institutional degree attainment rates with the IPEDS GRS data in order to reduce burden on schools since they already have or will have to report the IPEDS data. Also, the IPEDS data are likely to be much more uniform since they have standard definitions.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 3.1 were dropped because there was no data collection plan in place to obtain the needed information and were replaced by indicators based on ongoing national data collection systems. The remainder of the indicators related to the specific component programs of the Title III Program and were dropped in favor of uniform measures across the Title III Program.

New

- Indicator 1.1 uses nationally available data on specialized accreditation to address issues regarding improvements in the quality of academic programs.

DUAL DEGREE PROGRAMS FOR MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS

Goal: To enable students in minority-serving institutions to earn dual degrees.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to Hispanic-serving Institutions, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities (TCCUS) and Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian serving Institutions to establish dual degree programs increasing academic opportunities for their students.
FY 2001—$40,000,000 (Requested budget for proposed new program)

OBJECTIVE 1: TO INCREASE POSTGRADUATE ACCESS AND PERSISTENCE FOR STUDENTS AT MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Postgraduate opportunities: Rate at which students at grantee institutions enter and complete graduate study will increase by 20 percent within 6 years. (This is the long-run expectation for the program. In the interim, enrollment in dual degree programs is expected to increase each year at grantee institutions.)

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Newly proposed program.	**Source:** Grantee Progress Reports.
1999:	**No data available; program not in existence in FY99.**	**N/A; program not funded**	**Explanation:** If authorized, funds would probably not be received by grantees until sometime in 2001. Performance data would be available 12-15 months after grants are disbursed.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2002.
2000:		N/A; program not funded		**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
2001:		Baseline measure of enrollment in dual degree programs.		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are obtained through grantee self-reports.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

Not applicable; program was not in existence in FY 1999 or FY 2000.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Conduct grant competition to maximize the probability of funding successful grantees.
- Provide technical assistance and encourage communication to help support grantees in establishing dual degree programs.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Program will work with the White House Initiative on HBCUs, Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans, and Tribal Colleges to coordinate assistance being provided across the Federal government to these institutions.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Newly proposed program; challenges have not yet been identified.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Not applicable; program not in existence.

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Not applicable; program not in existence.

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

New—Not applicable.

656

657

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDIES PROGRAM

Goal: To meet the Nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Objective supports strategic plan Objectives 3.2 (completion of high-quality educational program), 4.1 (customer service), and 1.4 (talented teachers).

FY 2000—$69,702,000

FY 2001—$73,022,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: MAINTAIN A U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM ABLE TO PRODUCE EXPERTS IN LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES AND AREA STUDIES WHO ARE CAPABLE OF CONTRIBUTING TO THE NEEDS OF U.S. GOVERNMENT, ACADEMIC, AND BUSINESS INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Title VI-supported institutions provide most of the instruction in less commonly taught languages.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Undergraduate			**Status:** Undergraduate: Unable to judge. Graduate: Target met. Future data source will be EELIAS, which will provide annual and final reports data on a more timely basis. **Explanation:** While Title VI-supported institutions account for less than 3 percent of all higher education institutions, they enroll 55 percent of the graduate enrolled students and 21 percent of the undergraduate enrollment in less commonly taught languages.	**Source:** Association of Departments of Foreign Languages. *Frequency:* Every 3-4 years. *Next Update:* 2000. **Source:** EELIAS Project. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000 annual performance reports. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvement:** Data supported by program.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1995:	21%			
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		No target set		
FY 2001:		No target set		
Graduate				
FY 1995:	55%			
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		55%		
FY 2001:		55%		

Indicator 1.2 Percentage of graduates of Title VI-supported programs who report that they found employment that utilizes their language and area skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Ph.D. graduates of Title VI institutions			**Status:** Target mc **Explanation:** Approximately 20 percent of the career placements data is missing. Most M.A. recipients either continue their graduate study (thus becoming the future experts) or find employment in the private sector as international professionals, while most Ph.D. recipients find employment at U.S. institutions of higher education (experts) or in the private sector.	**Source:** FY 1994-FY 1996 National Resource Centers annual and final reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 1997-FY 1999 cycle. Data from Middle East and Pacific Islands NRC's are missing; not all centers at all institutions reported career placements data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1996:	76%			
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		76%		
FY 2001:		76%		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		**Source:** EELIAS Project. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000 annual performance reports. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvement:** Data supported by program.
M.A. graduates				
FY 1996:	44%			
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		44%		
FY 2001:		44%		
M.A. graduates continuing their studies				
FY 1996:	24%			
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		24%		
FY 2001:		24%		

OBJECTIVE 2: TO ESTABLISH AN INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC POLICY (IIPP) TO CONDUCT A PROGRAM TO SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE THE NUMBERS OF UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITIES IN THE INTERNATIONAL SERVICE.

Indicator 2.1 The number of IIPP graduates employed in the international service.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Program is on target. The first cohort of IIPP fellows will complete 5-year program in June 2000. Future data source will be EELIAS, which will provide annual and final reports data. **Explanation:** The IIPP comprehensive program of study is a 5-year program with six components. It currently consists of the following: (1) sophomore summer policy institute; (2) junior year abroad; (3) junior year summer policy institute; (4) post-senior-year intensive language instruction; (5) post-baccalaureate internships at international affairs agencies and organizations; and (6) Master's degree in international relations. The first cohort of fellows will complete the comprehensive program in June 2000. The benchmark for this program will be based on the data collected on this group.	**Source:** Annual reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next update:* Fall 2000. Future data will be available from EELIAS. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvement:** Data supported by program.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No graduates**		
FY 2000:		5		
FY 2001:		7		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Set program priorities where relevant and consult with international education constituency to encourage expanded coverage for underrepresented areas and fields.
- Support through program funds advanced levels of uncommonly taught foreign languages; expand disciplinary offerings in world area and international studies.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Improve data collection system using EELIAS.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Coordination is conducted through the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training.
- Foreign projects are conducted with assistance of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- All objectives and their indicators were dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Objective 1 was restated to better reflect national needs.
- Indicator 1.1 was modified to be this year's Indicator 1.1 to more adequately reflect institutional accomplishments.
- Indicator 1.2 was modified to be this year's Indicator 1.2 to reflect the broader needs for graduates of Title VI institutions.

Dropped

- Objective 2 and its Indicator 2.1 were dropped because they did not adequately measure program performance.

New

- Objective 2 and its Indicator 2.1 were added to reflect the IIPP's role in increasing the number of under represented minorities in international service.

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Goal: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 by helping to ensure the high quality of educational programs through reform and innovation.

FY 2000—$74,249,000

FY 2001—$31,200,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROMOTE REFORMS THAT IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING AT POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Quality of postsecondary reforms: The percentage of innovative educational reforms that are tested and implemented will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

FIPSE projects scoring A, B, or C in overall quality

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	84%	
1998:	88%	
1999:	**100%**	**No target set**
2000:		100%
2001:		100%

Assessment of Progress

Status: FY 2000 target met in 1999.

Explanation: The perfect figure for 1999 reflects the quality of FIPSE's grant awards and improved monitoring systems. FIPSE expects project quality to remain at approximately this level. Seventy-three percent of its projects scored "A" or "B." Special attention is being given to raise this number by improving the quality of "C"-graded projects.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Final Report Score Card.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by FIPSE program officers upon review of project reports. Special monitoring of "C"-graded projects.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Constructing new site visit instrument to collect on-site data on quality of reforms.

Indicator 1.2 Replication of projects: The number of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions, will increase over the number in previous years.

Targets and Performance Data

FIPSE grantees reporting full or partial project dissemination to others

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998:	92%	
1999:	**100%**	**No target set**
2000:		100%
2001:		100%

Assessment of Progress

Status: FY 2000 target met in 1999.

Explanation: FIPSE considers itself successful on this measure if 9 of every 10 projects result in project models being adapted/replicated on other campuses. The current figure slightly exceeds this benchmark, and FIPSE has set its FY 2000 target higher than that.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Final Report Score Card, 1998.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).

Performance Report Score Card, 1998
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).

E-mail survey of 1990-99 grantees.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000 (will revise to include additional e-mail addressees).

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedure: Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments; visits by external evaluator. Same or similar questions in two report cards yield similar results. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Self-reported data. Special dissemination initiatives planned for FY2000, including a dissemination conference and monograph, will produce additional dissemination data that may validate the data above.

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE PARTICIPATION AND COMPLETION RATES OF STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

Indicator 2.1 Student completion rate: Participants in FIPSE persistence-related projects will complete postsecondary education at higher rates than in previous years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of retention/completion projects reporting improved student persistence rates			**Status:** Positive movement toward target. **Explanation:** Projects addressing persistence issues face numerous difficulties in implementation. Past experience suggests that a 75 percent success rate would be extraordinary.	**Source:** Final Report Score Card. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely). **Validation Procedure:** Data reported by directors of access/retention projects. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported. Small sample size.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	48%			
1998:	35%			
1999:	**62%**	**No target set**		
2000:		75%		
2001:		80%		

OBJECTIVE 3: INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF FIPSE PROGRAMS.

Indicator 3.1 Projects sustained: The number of projects sustained at least 2 years beyond Federal funding will be maintained or increased beyond current level.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects reporting full or partial institutionalization on their home campuses			**Status:** Positive movement toward target. **Explanation:** FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of long-term continuation plans are designed to imbed projects within campus structures. If 9 of 10 FIPSE projects achieve institutionalization, FIPSE will have achieved its purpose. However, FIPSE will set its target higher than that.	**Source:** E-mail survey of 1990-99. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000 (will revise to include additional e-mail addressees). Final Report Score Card *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	93%			
1999:	**96%**	**No target set**		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedure: Self-reports and campus visits by program officers. New, common site visit evaluation form is being developed to validate narrative reports and furnish additional cross-project data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** External evaluations planned for major FIPSE programs in FY 2000 and 2001. It has been difficult to quantify descriptive site visit reports until we have the new evaluation form is available.

OBJECTIVE 4: IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION FOR FIPSE PROGRAMS.

Indicator 4.1 Project directors, overall satisfaction with FIPSE programs and services: Satisfaction levels from previous year will be met or exceeded.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees reporting that FIPSE staff provides full support			**Status:** FY 2000 targets met in 1999. **Explanation:** FIPSE staff has agreed to devote the current year to improving project monitoring and technical assistance efforts. A comprehensive set of monitoring procedures is being developed. Annual and final report guidelines are being revised, focusing on indicator variables.	**Source:** Survey of project directors at annual meeting, 1999; project survey, annual, 1999; e-mail survey of 1990-98 grantees, annual, 2000; Final Report Score Card, annual, 1999. (Revisions planned; see notes above). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Triangulation of four measures noted above, all yielding similar results. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** E-mail survey being expanded to greater numbers of faculty and staff who are now online.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	98%			
1998:	98%			
1999:	**100%**	**No target set**		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- FIPSE will continue to support promising innovative strategies for increasing institutional performance and the quality of teaching.
- FIPSE will continue to provide outreach seminars to under-served populations, full technical assistance to prospective grantees, and feedback to all unsuccessful applicants.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Access to higher education and program completion will be highlighted as major guideline priorities of the Comprehensive Project. FIPSE will support innovative strategies for increasing program completion and disseminate successful programs nationally.
- FIPSE will support development and testing of new models of project adaptation and dissemination.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- On international education programs, consults regularly with the State Department and USIA.
- On congressional earmarks, FIPSE assisted the Department of Defense in awarding $8 million in grants.
- On evaluation and peer review procedures, FIPSE advises the evaluation team of the National Endowment for the Arts.
- On teacher education, FIPSE assists on review sites and evaluation for the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology Program.
- On learning through technology, FIPSE assists in the development of peer review procedures and evaluation techniques for the Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships Program.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- Salaries and Expenses (S&E) funds may be insufficient to fully implement planning for improved monitoring and evaluation.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- In accordance with departmental recommendations that the number of indicators be pared, 2-year-old Indicators 1.2 (number of qualifying projects) and 1.3 (number of national awards) were dropped, along with Objectives 3 (encourage international cooperation), 4 (prepare students for work in new international contexts), 5 (maintain or increase FIPSE programs' effectiveness through dissemination), and 7 (increased leverage of grant funds); Indicators 8.1 (reduce turnaround time), 9.1, and 9.2 (improve communication); and Objective 10 (maintain high levels of technical assistance).

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 4.2 (novice application success rate) was dropped; while FIPSE continues to use it for internal purposes, this indicator did not reflect program outcomes or effectiveness.
- Indicator 4.4 was dropped because it tapped largely the same pool of applicants as 4.1, on the same variable—satisfaction with programs and services.

New—None.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO ENSURE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE A QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION

Goal: To improve the quality of higher education for students with disabilities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to postsecondary institutions to aid in the development of model programs for ensuring that students with disabilities can receive a high-quality postsecondary education.

FY 2000—$5,000,000

FY 2001—$5,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ENSURE THAT RESEARCH AND OTHER INFORMATION SYNTHESIZED THROUGH GRANT ACTIVITIES IS STATE OF THE ART.

Indicator 1.1 State-of-the-art research and dissemination of program materials and outcomes: Evaluation activities will show that 100 percent of the synthesized research and all information disseminated through grant activities are state of the art and have national dissemination.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available.	**Sources:** Program data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**First performance report due June 2000**	**No target set**		
2000:		100%	**Explanation:** This is a new grant program. Grants were funded September 9, 1999, and performance data will be available June 2000. The determination of whether program materials are state of the art will be made by a panel of outside reviewers with expertise in the relevant subject area.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
2001:		100%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported and will be reviewed by external panel.

OBJECTIVE 2: ENSURE THAT FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INCREASE THEIR CAPACITY TO PROVIDE A HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATION TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES.

Indicator 2.1 Increased attendance: The number of students with disabilities attending an institution benefiting from grants will increase each year beginning in 2001.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available.	**Sources:** Performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**First performance report due June 2000**	**No target set**		
2000:		Baseline to be established	**Explanation:** This is a new grant program. Grants were funded September 9, 1999, and performance data will be available June 2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
2001:		Continuing increase in attendance		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indicator 2.2 Increased degree attainment: The number of students with disabilities completing coursework leading to a degree or attainment of a degree at an institution benefiting from grants will increase each year beginning in 2001.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available.	**Sources:** Performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**First performance report due June 2000**	**No target set**		
2000:		Baseline to be established	**Explanation:** This is a new grant program. Grants were funded September 9, 1999, and performance data will be available June 2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
2001:		Continuing increase in degree attainment		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported.

Indicator 2.3 Professional Development: The numbers of faculty and administrators that are competent to provide a high-quality education to students with disabilities as a result of grant activities will increase each year beginning in 2001.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available.	**Sources:** Performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**First performance report due June 2000**	**No target set**		
2000:		Baseline to be established	**Explanation:** This is a new grant program. Grants were funded September 9, 1999, and performance data will be available June 2000.	**Validation Procedure:** Data will be provided by grantees.
2001:		Continuing increase in the number of competent faculty		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Encourage high-quality education for students with disabilities and share methods and curriculum development and successful professional development approaches among grantees and other institutes of higher education professionals.
- Disseminate nationally training materials through grantees and Office of Postsecondary Education.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Strictly evaluate grantees to ensure that only state-of-the-art-research and information are disseminated.
- Disseminate information on project outcomes to other institutions of higher education.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Funded projects must coordinate activities with other federally funded projects, such as the Rehabilitation and Research Training Center on Educational Supports and the National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary Education for Individuals With Disabilities.
- This program coordinates activities with other programs within the Office of Postsecondary Education and within the Department of Education such as the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services and the Office for Civil Rights, and externally with the National Science Foundation, the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor. In particular, Program staff will discuss the development of this program and receive technical assistance from Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services every 2 weeks.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The major challenge is resistance from institutes of higher education to participate in this program and make systemic policy and program changes for educating students with disabilities. Internally, this program faces the challenge of being the first disability program in the Office of Postsecondary Education.
- This program has not been evaluated as yet and no recommendations have been made.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.1, 1.2, and 2.1 were adjusted to add clarity.

Dropped—None.

New

- Indicator 2.3 was added to address professional development measures.

676

677

ANNUAL INTEREST SUBSIDY GRANTS

Goal: To continue to help finance construction, reconstruction, or renovation of higher education facilities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing the capital needed to renovate higher education facilities for schools unable to obtain private credit at reasonable rates.

FY 2000—$12,000,000

FY 2001—$10,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: CONTINUE TO PROVIDE STRONG FISCAL MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAM.

Indicator 1.1 Positive audit results: There will be no material internal control weaknesses identified in program portion of Department's financial statement audit.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
No material internal control weaknesses were identified in the program portion of the Department's 1998 financial statement audits.			**Status:** No 1999 data are available. **Explanation:** When 1999 audit is completed it is expected to result in another finding of no material control weaknesses.	**Source:** Financial program audits. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvement:** Unknown.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No finding of material control weaknesses**		
2000:		No finding of material control weaknesses		
2001:		No finding of material control weaknesses		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Tighten internal controls to significantly improve the overall fiscal reliability of the operating system. These controls include the following:
  - Status and terms of all underlying loans will be verified every 2 years. Half of the grants will be verified each year.
  - An informational letter will be sent to all grantees yearly to remind them of their obligation to notify the Department of refinancing agreements or redemption.
  - Control totals for the number of grants and the dollar amounts of each obligation for each fiscal year have been established and will be updated as needed.
  - To ensure the accuracy of the system, each year someone other than the grant manager will perform an independent reconciliation of the data base and the control total spreadsheet.

New or Strengthened Strategies

None.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- This program supports Title III and Title V program operations.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

TRIO PROGRAMS

Goal: Provide increased educational opportunities for low-income, first-generation students.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.1 (secondary school students get college preparatory support) and Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by funding organizations to provide the necessary support services to enable disadvantaged students to pursue postsecondary opportunities.

FY 2000—$645,000,000

FY 2001—$725,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASE PARTICIPATION AND COMPLETION RATES OF LOW-INCOME, FIRST-GENERATION INDIVIDUALS IN THE ACADEMIC PIPELINE.

Indicator 1.1 Persistence in and completion of education programs: TRIO students will persist in and complete their educational programs.

Targets and Performance Data

Upward Bound (UB): Length of time Upward Bound students participate in the project during high school, and college enrollment rates of UB participants

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Project Persistence	College Enrollment	
1996:	19 months (base)	No data available	
1997:	No data available	78% (in 1998-99)	
1999:	**No data available**		**No target set**
2000:			
2001:			

College persistence

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	67% (base)	
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**
2000:		67%
2001:		67%

College completion

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998:	29% (base)	
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**
2000:		29%
2001:		29%

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data.

Explanation: Data from the national evaluations of the Upward Bound and Student Support Services programs provide the baseline data for these programs. The annual performance report data provided the baseline for the McNair Program. The Student Support Services (SSS) and McNair performance reports will be used to determine if the performance targets are met in 2000 and 2001.

Upward Bound (UB): On average, Upward Bound participants persist in the project for only 19 months. The national evaluation of UB has shown that longer participation in the program (at least 24 months) significantly increases the educational benefits to students. Evaluation findings also show that college enrollment rates significantly increase for Upward Bound participants academically at risk or with lower educational expectations, but that the program has little impact on college enrollment rates or other educational outcomes of most participants.

The 1998-99 followup survey of Upward Bound participants conducted by Mathematica showed that 78 percent of the students offered an opportunity to participate in the Upward Bound program enrolled in a 2- or 4-year college.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Mathematica Upward Bound evaluation, 1999.
Frequency: Annually.
Next update: 2000.

Westat SSS evaluation, 1999.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

McNair performance reports, 1998-99.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000 for Upward Bound evaluation and the SSS and McNair performance reports; Upward Bound performance report data will be available in 2002.

Validation Procedures: The data collected by the national evaluation studies met the data quality standards developed by the Department. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., and Westat, Inc., used sampling techniques consistent with National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) guidelines. Further, response rate for students surveyed also meets Department standards.

The McNair performance report data come from the universe of grantees. Under contract with the Department, Mathematica will be reviewing and editing the data so that valid estimates of graduate school enrollment and persistence rates of McNair participants can be determined. The 1998-99 data will be used as the base.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
McNair: Percentage of McNair participants who enroll in graduate school within a year of completing the bachelor's degree, and percentage persisting toward or completing graduate degree			Student Support Services (SSS): Preliminary analysis of data from the national evaluation of SSS showed that 67 percent of full-time freshman participants in SSS returned to the same school for the second year. The study also showed that 29 percent of the SSS students earned an associate's, bachelor's, or higher degree within 6 years of starting postsecondary education at the same college (68 percent earned an associate's or higher from any college within 6 years of starting). The college completion targets for SSS are based on the percentage of SSS students who complete an associate's degree or higher within 6 years of starting college at the same college. Although this substantially underestimates the percentage that received a postsecondary degree, the SSS performance report only requires grantees to track the academic progress of students who remain at their institution through graduation. Therefore, reliable data on graduation rates is only available annually for SSS students who remain at the same college. Because approximately 45 percent of SSS grants are at 2-year institutions, the target is based on students who earn an associate's or higher degree. Performance targets for 2000 and 2001 are set at the baseline. Based on the findings of the national evaluation of the SSS program, SSS participants benefit significantly from the program. Although increases in the persistence and college completion rates of SSS students are desirable, increases are unlikely in 2000 and 2001 given the current funding levels for these projects. McNair: Preliminary data from the 1998-99 performance reports show that 35 percent of McNair participants enroll in graduate school within a year of completing the bachelor's degree. Further, 48 percent of McNair students who have begun a graduate program are persisting. Although these percentages appear to be reasonably valid, they are based on incomplete data. Therefore, these percentages may be adjusted in the future when more complete information on graduate school enrollment and persistence rates can be collected.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The national evaluations have provided baseline data for the UB and SSS programs and also provide data on appropriate comparison groups. However, these evaluations cannot be used to measure program improvements on an annual basis. Therefore, the Department has been developing new performance reports to collect the needed information. Currently, the data collected from the SSS and McNair reports can be used to determine if annual performance targets are met. The new Upward Bound performance report is being designed to capture data appropriate to the performance indicators.
Graduate school enrollment				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	35% (base)			
1999:	**No data available**	**35%**		
2000:		35%		
2001:		35%		
Graduate school persistence				
1998:	48% (base)			
1999:	**No data available**	**48%**		
2000:		48%		
2001:		48%		

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY.

Indicator 2.1 Streamlined grants award process: The time from receipt of applications to the notification/awards to grantees will be reduced.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average time elapsed			**Status:** Over the last few years the Office of Federal TRIO programs has substantially reduced the time between receipt of applications and the notification of awards from an average of 10 months to 8 months. **Explanation:** Further reductions in the time elapsed are not realistic for most TRIO competitions because of the number of applications received and the number of grants awarded (i.e., in fiscal year 2001, 1,200 to 1,300 applications are anticipated with between 800 and 900 awards).	**Source:** ED grant review schedule, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* Fiscal Year 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Review of grant award process from application deadline through notification of awards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	10 months			
1998:	9 months			
1999:	**7-8 months**	**8 months**		
2000:		8 months		
2001:		8 months		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To better measure the success of funded projects in meeting the goals of the Federal TRIO programs, the performance reports have been redesigned for the Student Support Services and McNair programs. Staff have used some of the data to provide better feedback to grantees on project and student performance that may be used to improve the quality and effectiveness of funded projects.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- In FY 2000, the Department plans to use the increase in funding for the Federal TRIO programs for the following:
  - To improve the operations and effectiveness of TRIO projects and to familiarize TRIO staff with new educational technology and effective strategies for using technology, an additional $1 million have been allocated to the TRIO Staff Training Program.
  - To expand the use of technology in the TRIO programs that will help bridge the "digital divide" for low-income students and to help projects prepare for the electronic submission of grant applications, $10 million are allocated assist projects in upgrading equipment and implement programs that use new educational technologies.
  - To enhance recruitment strategies in Upward Bound projects, we have allocated some funds. According to the national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program, students with lower preparation and expectations benefit the most from Upward Bound services.
- With the Department's FY 2001 budget request of $725 million for the Federal TRIO programs, some funds will be available to implement recommendations from the national evaluation studies of the Student Support Services and Upward Bound programs:
  - To increase the intensity of services provided to Student Support Services project participants, per student funding levels will increase. The national evaluation has shown that greater service levels result in greater educational impacts.
  - To provide scholarship assistance and summer programs for Student Support Services (SSS) participants, $35 million have been allocated.
  - To increase the retention (length of participation) of Upward Bound participants in the program, allocate some funds to begin funding the newly authorized work-study activities are planned.. The national evaluation has shown that the longer a student participates in the program the greater the educational benefits. Nonetheless, many Upward Bound students leave the program early, often citing the need to work as the main reason.
- To capture data appropriate to the performance indicators, the performance report is being redesigned for the Upward Bound (UB) Program. This new form is being developed with substantial input from the TRIO community. Data from a redesigned Upward Bound performance report will be available to assess performance targets as early as 2002.
- To help projects successfully implement program improvements, the Department of Education will continue to disseminate information on effective practices and strategies obtained from the national evaluation studies of the Student Support Services and Upward Bound programs.
- To better serve our customers, a number of initiatives have been undertaken, including the following:
  - Streamlining the grants award process.
  - Posting application packages for TRIO funding on the Web.
  - Conducting application preparation workshops to encourage more high-quality applications for TRIO funding.
- To provide information on effective intervention and opportunity programs, funds will continue to the TRIO Clearinghouse.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- TRIO projects work closely with the newly authorized and funded Gear-Up projects. Because many low-income communities have both TRIO and Gear Up projects, there has been some coordination of activities at the local level. TRIO projects work closely with the Office of Student Financial Assistance (OSFA) in order to assist TRIO students in getting adequate financial aid to attend college. In addition to disseminating information on financial aid to TRIO projects, Office of Student Financial Assistance staff have provided training to TRIO staff on financial aid issues. Upward Bound projects continue to receive funding for student meals during the summer component from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Data on students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch are also used by many TRIO projects to identify participants and document eligibility for services. Further, many of the TRIO outreach projects (Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Educational Opportunity Centers) work closely at the local level with Private Industry councils and Work Force centers funded through the U.S. Department of Labor.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- The Planning and Evaluation Service has sponsored national evaluation studies of the Student Support Services and Upward Bound programs. In the case of both of these programs, the indicators and strategies directly relate to recent evaluation findings. For example, the Upward Bound study noted that the average length of participation in the program is 19 months but that program impact is greater for students who remain in the program for at least 24 months. Therefore, one of the performance targets for Upward Bound is to increase the average number of months a Upward Bound student participates in the program (or increase the percentage of Upward Bound students that participate in the program for longer than 19 months). Further, in FY 2000 some funds have been allocated to help Upward Bound projects enhance recruitment strategies for students who according to the national evaluation, can benefit most from participation in the Upward Bound Program. Over the past several years, we have given Student Support Services projects have received small funding increases so that those projects may increase the intensity of services provided. In our FY 2001 budget, we also have requested substantial funds to increase the per student funding levels in Student Support Services projects. Also included in our FY 2001 budget request are some funds to begin to fund work-study activities to increase the retention of students in the Upward Bound Program. However, effectively implementing evaluation recommendations will require substantial increases in TRIO funding as well as the support of all the stakeholders, including the TRIO community.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.2—Postsecondary enrollment in the FY 1999 plan was revised for the FY 2000 plan to include only Upward Bound participants. Further, the comparison group was changed from "comparable nonparticipants" to the "national average."

Dropped

- Indicator 1.1—High school completion in the FY 1999 plan was dropped from the FY 2000 plan.
- Indicator 2.1 (postsecondary persistence and completion)—the third part of this indicator was dropped from the FY 2000 plan.
- Indicator 3.1 (graduate school enrollment and completion)—the second part of this indicator was dropped from the FY 2000 plan.
- Indicators 4.1, 4.3, 4.4 were dropped as well as Objective 5 and all of its indicators.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted— None.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.1, 2.1, and 3.1 were dropped and replaced by one new indicator to measure TRIO students' persistence and completion of their educational programs. Because reliable baseline data on postsecondary graduation rates of Upward Bound participants and graduate degree attainment rates for McNair participants are not yet available, these measures are not included in the FY 2001 plan.
- References in the FY 2000 plan to "comparable nonparticipants" have been deleted.
- Indicator 2.2 was also dropped, because we have no plans at this time to collect additional data on customer satisfaction.

New

- New baseline data and annual performance targets for the Upward Bound, Student Support Services, and McNair programs have been added to the FY 2001 plan.

GAINING EARLY AWARENESS AND READINESS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS (GEAR UP)

Goal: To ensure that disadvantaged middle school and secondary school students are prepared for, pursue, and succeed in postsecondary education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.1 (secondary school students get the information, skills, and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education) by creating local partnership and state programs to provide information and individualized support services such as mentoring and tutoring to middle and secondary school students and their parents to help students prepare for postsecondary education.

FY 2000—$200,000,000

FY 2001—$325,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASE THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND PREPARATION FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION OF PARTICIPATING STUDENTS.

Indicator 1.1 Completion of academically challenging curricula: Program participants will successfully complete college preparatory courses such as algebra, geometry, chemistry, and physics at increasing rates.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percent of seventh graders who passed the following subject areas			**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available.	**Source:** Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		*Next Update:* 2000.
2000:		Baseline data	**Explanation:** Interim data will be collected on successful completion of core academic subjects until students reach grades where they may take algebra, geometry, etc.	
2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE RATE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION AND PARTICIPATION IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION OF PARTICIPATING STUDENTS.

Indicator 2.1 Attendance, high school completion, and postsecondary enrollment: Program participants will have high rates of attendance in school, be promoted to the next grade level on time, and successfully complete high school and enroll in postsecondary education programs at increasing rates.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of participating seventh graders promoted to the next grade level and the percentage with high rates of attendance			**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available.	**Source:** Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		*Next Update:* 2000.
2000:		Baseline data	**Explanation:** First data available in 2000.	
2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

OBJECTIVE 3: INCREASE EDUCATIONAL EXPECTATIONS FOR PARTICIPATING STUDENTS AND STUDENT AND FAMILY KNOWLEDGE OF POSTECONDARY EDUCATION OPTIONS, PREPARATION, AND FINANCING.

Indicator 3.1 Knowledge of postsecondary education costs, financing, and academic preparation: Program participants and their families will increasingly report having knowledge of postsecondary education costs, available financial aid, and necessary academic preparation for college.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available.	**Source:** Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline data	**Explanation:** First data available in 2000.	*Next Update:* 2000.
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 3.2 Student, family, and teacher expectations: Participating students, their families, and their teachers will have high educational expectations, which are sustained throughout the life of the program.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available.	**Source:** Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**N/A**		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Baseline data	**Explanation:** First data available in 2000.	*Next Update:* 2000.
FY 2001:		Sustained high expectations		**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Disseminate information to prospective applicants, collect and report information on best practices, and support high-quality projects by working with national organizations such as the Ford Foundation.
- Provide grantee flexibility and ensure program integrity and accountability by working with the community to develop program regulations and other program requirements that impose minimal burden.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Provide grantees and their partners with technical assistance through telephone contact, e-mail, and periodic workshops to forge a results-oriented program, in which grantees' services (a) are directly linked to annual objectives and program goals, (b) are based on empirical evidence that attests to their effectiveness in raising the aspirations and academic performance of low-income youth, and (c) produce measurable, quantifiable outcomes.
- Write and disseminate technical memoranda to grantees on issues such as collecting, maintaining, and assessing baseline data on students; and establishing benchmarks of expected levels of achievement at specific time intervals during the year.
- Develop data shells to facilitate grantees' collection, assessment, and submission of student demographic, program participation, and outcome data.
- Develop a standardized annual performance report.

693

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- Supplements HUD efforts to provide educational assistance and other supports to children and parents living in public housing, as defined in section 3(b) (1) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937.
- Fosters a relationship between the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services (HHS), because the Gear Up legislation requires state grantees that do not use a whole-grade cohort approach to target students in preschool through 12th grade who are eligible for Title I services, free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Act (NSLA), or assistance under Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), as authorized by Title I of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.
- Encourages grantees to assist HHS in its efforts to provide information to low-income parents with respect to the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP).
- Coordinates resources, data collection and analysis efforts, and policy with other primary Federal initiatives such as Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology, Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships, and Quality of Teacher Preparation.
- Links partnership and state grantees to federally sponsored regional programmatic initiatives, such as the 10 Regional Educational Laboratories and 6 Regional Technology in Education Consortia, in order to obtain technical assistance in areas such as assessment and accountability; curriculum, learning, and instruction; technology, and urban education.
- Takes the initiative to coordinate with, complement, and enhance the efforts of state programs and initiatives such as Liberty Partnership Program and Science and Technology Entry Program in New York and local initiatives such as the Boston Compact and the Boston Plan for Excellence (MA).

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- Ensuring that the intervention strategies (a) are based on empirical evidence that attests to their effectiveness in preparing low-income youth for more advanced learning and (b) produce measurable and quantifiable outcomes.
- Ensuring that Gear Up students actively and consistently participate in services that address their educational needs; enhance their capacity for more accelerated learning; and improve their classroom achievement, standardized test scores, and ability to meet rigorous college entrance requirements.
- Ensuring that grantees will
  (a) benchmark the progress of students, by setting expected values of student achievement at specific intervals during the school year;
  (b) use valid, analytically sound methods to measure students' classroom performance;
  (c) assess students' knowledge of college programs, costs, and financing opportunities;
  (d) compare expected to actual values of student performance at frequent time intervals; and
  (e) make appropriate adjustments to the type, quality, frequency, and duration of Gear Up provisions.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—N/A.

Dropped—N/A.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year)

Adjusted

- Objective 3 became this year's Objective 2, and is worded, "Increase the rate of high school graduation and participation in postsecondary education of participating students."
- Objective 2 became this year's Objective 3, and is worded, "Increase educational expectations for participating students, and student and family knowledge of postsecondary options, preparation, and financing."
- The number of objectives has been reduced from five (last year) to three (this year).
- Last year's Indicators 1.2 and 3.1 were combined to streamline performance plans, resulting in this year's Indicator 2.1. Last year's Indicators 2.1 and 2.3 were combined to streamline performance plans, resulting in this year's Indicator 3.1.
- The term "guidance counselors" was eliminated in Indicator 2.2 because of measurement difficulties and in order to reduce reporting burden on grantees, resulting in this year's Indicator 3.2.

Dropped

- Objectives 4 and 5 were dropped.
- Indicators 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, and 5.1 were dropped because they did not measure program outcomes. These indicators will be retained for internal management purposes.
- The number of indicators has been reduced from 10 (last year) to 4 (this year).

New—None.

BYRD HONORS SCHOLARSHIPS PROGRAM

Goal: To promote student excellence and achievement and to recognize exceptionally able students who show promise of continued excellence.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This objective supports Strategic Plan Goal 3, which focuses on ensuring that all students motivated and academically ready to attend postsecondary education have the financial resources and support services needed to do so.
FY 2000—$39,859,000
FY 2001—$41,001,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: BYRD SCHOLARS WILL SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT HIGH RATES.

Indicator 1.1 Completion of postsecondary education programs: Ninety percent or more of Byrd scholars will successfully complete postsecondary education programs within 4 years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Byrd scholars graduating within 4 years or receiving a scholarship for 4 years			**Status:** Target met. **Explanation:** States reported in 1999 that 96 percent of students receiving a Byrd scholarship in 1995 either graduated or received 4 years of funding, indicating that they were on track to graduate.	**Source:** Performance report. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by states, who certify the accuracy of the data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are based on grantee reports of varying quality and accuracy on the number of Byrd Scholars graduating and/or receiving 4 years of Byrd funding. Byrd Scholars may not have received 4 years of Byrd funding for a variety of reasons other than failure to complete an academic program, including early graduation or no unmet financial need. Future performance reports will request grantees to report the exact number of graduating Byrd Scholars; however, it appears likely that many states are unable to collect these data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	85%			
1998:	90%			
1999:	**96%**	**90% or higher**		
2000:		90% or higher		
2001:		90% or higher		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999
None

New or Strengthened Strategies
- Developed revised performance report to collect all information needed to measure program outcomes.
- Communicate with state agencies at the beginning of the school year and mid-year to highlight the importance of awarding all funds.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- In order to gather and maintain accurate records showing college entry levels and completion rates for Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship recipients, the Byrd Program office will work in tandem with the state educational agency representatives to develop a more frequent communication strategy. The Byrd Program office will also serve as a link to other OPE offices that can be of assistance to the states for this purpose.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Encouraging states to commit resources (other than grant dollars) for the collection of data to track participants.
- Consistency and accuracy of reported data.
- Resources to analyze and interpret statistical data as collected.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Replaced indicators stating that 100 percent of scholarship funds will be awarded and reallocated with indicator measuring academic outcomes for scholarship recipients.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

GRADUATE ASSISTANCE IN AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED (GAANN) AND JAVITS FELLOWSHIPS

Goal: To increase the number of persons trained at the highest academic level.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: GAANN and Javits support Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to institutions to support high-quality graduate students studying in areas of national need and by providing grants to students who show exceptional promise.

FY 2000—$51,000,000*

FY 2001—$41,000,000 (Requested budget)

* The additional $10 million in FY 2000 covers an additional year of funding for Javits Fellowships to begin providing funding for the program a year in advance rather than a change in funding of the program.

OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF GRADUATE STUDENTS IN AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED, INCLUDING THE NUMBER OF UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS.

Indicator 1.1 Graduate school completion: There will be an increase in the number of U.S. citizens and permanent residents who receive a GAANN fellowship and obtain a doctorate in an area of national need.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data; progress toward target is difficult to judge. **Explanation:** A survey is currently being conducted by the Office of Program Monitoring and Information Technology to determine (retroactively) the number of GAANN fellows who have obtained doctorate degrees.	**Source:** Program Monitoring and Information Technology Survey; annual program performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Subsequent performance data will be a required element in the annual performance report submitted by grantees.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Baseline		
2001:		Continuing increase		

Indicator 1.2 Enrollment of targeted populations: The percentage of GAANN fellows from underrepresented groups will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of fellows from traditionally underrepresented groups by grantee cohort

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets
	Alaskan/ Native American Indians	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black, Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Women	
1994:	1%	6%	10%	4%	38%	
1995:	1%	9%	7%	3%	36%	
1997:	2%	10%	7%	10%	39%	

Assessment of Progress

Status: No 1999 data are available; progress toward target is unlikely.

Explanation: The authorizing statute recommends, but does not mandate, that grantees seek individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups when awarding fellowships. However, in addressing the selection criteria, grantees pledge to include students from underrepresented groups.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Annual Performance Reports.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on a subset

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		(80 percent) of the grantees. Steps have been taken to ensure completeness of data for future years.
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**Continuing improvement**		
2000:		Continuing improvement		
2001:		Continuing improvement		

OBJECTIVE 2: TO ENABLE STUDENTS OF SUPERIOR ABILITY IN THE ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES TO COMPLETE THEIR TERMINAL DEGREE.

Indicator 2.1 Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within 7 years will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Rates of doctorate attainment by Javits fellows 7 years from enrollment			**Status:** No 1999 data are available; progress toward target is difficult to judge until we get more data points.	**Source:** Program performance reports; Survey of Earned Doctorates, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	30%			
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**Continuing improvement**		
2000:		Continuing improvement	**Explanation:** The Survey of Earned Doctorates collects only information on attainment of a doctorate degree. Some Javits fellows pursue programs in fields for which the terminal degree is below the doctorate level.	**Validation Procedure:** No formal verification procedure applied.
2001:		Continuing improvement		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The new Annual Performance Report will require grantees to report completion data on those fellows in programs where the Master of Fine Arts is the terminal degree.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To capture degree attainment for those Javits fellows who pursue the field of Fine Arts (where the terminal degree is a master's degree), ED will collect completion data in the program performance reports. The new performance report form is currently in the clearance process.
- To increase the recruitment of graduate students from underrepresented backgrounds, ED sponsored two graduate education conferences that focused on diversity in graduate education.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To address the goal of supporting individuals from underrepresented backgrounds, ED will emphasize the importance of this criterion in planned technical assistance workshops and presentations at national conferences. In addition, institutions will be asked to report in their annual performance reports the ethnicity of students they have recruited.
- To obtain information regarding the progress of students toward their degree completion, ED will continue our monitoring procedures.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The authorizing statute requires the Department to consult with other Federal agencies prior to the designation of the areas of national need. Some of the agencies the Department consults with are the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Labor, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Representatives from higher education associations also participate in the discussion. They offer insight and data regarding the academic discipline enrollment trends within U.S. institutions of higher education. From the 1998 consultation meeting, the Department learned of increasing interest by graduate students and universities in interdisciplinary programs. As a result, the Department extended an invitational priority to universities to submit interdisciplinary applications for the FY 2000 panel review competition. The Department of Labor provided data regarding 5-year projections for the workforce based on the academic field of study. ED staff participate in an annual roundtable discussion sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences, where representatives from various Federal agencies come together to discuss their graduate programs. Staff also participate in a similar annual meeting at the National Science Foundation.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- While the graduate assistance in areas of national need and Javits programs help with the financial aspects of attending postbaccalaureate studies, a number of other factors beyond the control of the programs affect graduate participation and completion to degree. The state of the economy and funding decisions made by postsecondary institutions and state governments are just two examples of factors that play an important role in determining whether the program goals are achieved.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Old Javits Objectives 1, 2, and 3 and old Javits Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.1 were dropped because there was no data collection plan in place to obtain the needed information and were replaced by new Objective 2 and new Indicator 2.1 to reflect current data collection efforts.
- Old GAANN (formerly National Need Graduate Fellowship Program, NNGFP) Indicators 1.2, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 3.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1, 10.1, 10.2, and 11.1 were dropped because there was no data collection plan in place to obtain the needed information.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Objective 1 was reworded for clarity. The goal is to increase the *number* of doctoral graduates in areas of national need. Increasing the graduation rate would not necessarily meet this goal if the number of those pursuing graduate degrees decreased.
- Indicator 1.1 was reworded to be consistent with the new wording of Objective 1.
- For graduate students, the term *financially needy* is difficult to make meaningful in the traditional sense. Because of this ambiguity, this aspect of the indicator was eliminated.
- Objective 2 was changed to the *completion rate* from the *time to completion* to reflect data collected capabilities.
- Indicator 2.1 was adjusted to align with the modified Objective 2.

Dropped—None.

New

- The goal of the program was changed to more closely reflect the "intent" of the GAANN and Javits programs.

704 705

CHILD CARE ACCESS MEANS PARENTS IN SCHOOL PROGRAM

Goal: To support the participation of low-income parents in the postsecondary education system through the provision of campus-based child care services.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to institutions of higher education to increase the availability of campus-based child care services to low-income students.
FY 2000—$5,000,000
FY 2001—$15,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASE ACCESS FOR LOW-INCOME PARENTS TO POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Persistence/Completion rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who persist in and complete postsecondary education will meet or exceed target rate.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge.	**Source:** For persistence: Program or survey data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**	**Explanation:** New program; baseline data will be tied to set target performance goals in 2001. No performance data are yet available. Performance data will be collected through Annual Performance Reports, currently under development. Data to be available in fall 2001 will begin to assess graduation rate; however, it will be fall 2004 before this measurement will be reasonably mature.	**Source:** For completion: Program data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001.
2000:		No target set		**Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.
2001:		Target to be developed		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** We are hopeful the response rate will be high but are unsure of the percentage of child care centers that will be willing and able to obtain these data.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Program staff will meet with higher education associations and child care advocacy organizations to promote the program.
- Program staff will provide technical assistance workshops in strategic sites across the country.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Program staff is forming a network of grantees to share information about program experiences and best practices.
- Program staff is conducting site visits to ensure that our partnership agreement is maintained.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Program works to determine institutional eligibility and works with the Pell Grant system.
- Program staff coordinate with other interested government departments and agencies (e.g., Child Care Bureau) to promote the program and dissemination of the grant application.
- Program works to more effectively address needs of the disabled and works with the Disability Demonstration Project.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The small number of grantees does not provide a reasonable opportunity to show impact at the national level.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—Not Applicable.

Dropped—Not Applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—Not Applicable.

Dropped

- Previous Indicators (1.1 and 1.2).

New

- Both indicators above are new.

709

LEARNING ANYTIME ANYWHERE PARTNERSHIPS

Goal: To expand access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning through the use of technology to all citizens who are unable to take advantage of on-campus programs.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to postsecondary institutions to support pilot projects using technology and other innovations to enhance the delivery of postsecondary education and lifelong learning opportunities for all citizens, in all settings.

FY 2000—$23,269,000

FY 2001—$30,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: DEVELOP INNOVATIVE PARTNERSHIPS RESULTING IN ECONOMIES OF SCALE DELIVERING ASYNCHRONOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

Indicator 1.1 National Distribution: The number of products, courses, and/or degree programs developed for delivery statewide or nationally will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity (FY 2000).			**Status:** 29 funded projects in FY 1999 with statewide, multistate, or national scope. **Explanation:** Projects in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee annual reports; program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* June 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees and independent evaluators. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Establish baseline: number of courses/modules/products developed		
2001:		Baseline + 25% increase		

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE ACCESS TO ASYNCHRONOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION FOR DIVERSE GROUPS OF LEARNERS, ESPECIALLY TO PREPARE THEM FOR WO[illegible] TECHNICAL AND OTHER AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE OR FOR THE CHANGING REQUIREMENTS OF FIELDS.

Indicator 2.1 Number of "underserved" students: The number of underserved students enrolled each year will increase—that is, individuals with disabilities, in remote areas, welfare recipients or displaced workers, underrepresented populations (Native American, Hispanic, African American), and other adults not otherwise able to participate in postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity.			**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available. **Explanation:** Projects in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee annual reports; program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* June 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees and independent evaluators. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Establish baseline: number of underserved learners enrolled; ratio of number of students completing courses/modules to those enrolled		
2001:		Baseline + 20% increase		

710

Indicator 2.2 Course Completion Rate: The number of students who enroll in and complete courses or training programs will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity.			**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available. **Explanation:** Projects in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee annual reports; program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* June 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees and independent evaluators. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Establish baseline; ratio of number of students completing courses/modules to those enrolled		
2001:		Baseline + lowered ratio		

OBJECTIVE 3: ENABLE ADVANCEMENTS IN QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN POSTSECONDARY, ASYNCHRONOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION.

Indicator 3.1 Competency-based: The number of courses that base assessment on student competency, rather than on traditional units of instruction, will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity.			**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available. **Explanation:** Projects in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee annual reporting program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* June 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by independent evaluators. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Establish baseline: number of courses/modules that are competency-based		
2001:		Baseline + 25% increase		

OBJECTIVE 4: ENABLE ADVANCEMENTS IN FLEXIBILITY OF DISTANCE EDUCATION DESIGN AND DELIVERY.

Indicator 4.1 Adaptability: The education and training will demonstrate increasing use of technology that adapts content, pacing, or pedagogy to diverse learners.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity.			**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available. **Explanation:** Projects in startup mode. This indicator will be measured by direct observation of courseware prototypes by outside reviewers knowledgeable about instructional design, especially as it relates to Web-based learning.	**Source:** Program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* June 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by independent evaluators. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Establish baseline; courses/modules demonstrating adaptability in design		
2001:		Baseline + 20%		

OBJECTIVE 5: CONTINUATION OR EXPANSION OF LAAP PROJECTS BEYOND FEDERAL FUNDING.

Indicator 5.1 Projects sustained: Projects sustained or expanded at least 2 years beyond the Federal funding period.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity			**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available. **Explanation:** Projects in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee survey 2 years after funding ends. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* June 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data will be self-reported.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Establish baseline; courses/modules demonstrating adaptability in design		
2001:		Baseline + 20%		

OBJECTIVE 6: IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION FOR LAAP PROGRAMS.

Indicator 6.1 Project directors' overall satisfaction with LAAP programs and services: Meet or exceed satisfaction levels from previous years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity			**Status:** New program; performance data not yet available. **Explanation:** Projects in startup mode.	**Source:** Annual surveys. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* June 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data will be self-reported.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Establish baseline		
2001:		Baseline + 5% increase in satisfaction ratings		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

Not applicable.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To expand students' options beyond the level of what individual providers currently offer, LAAP encourages coordination and interaction among partners.
- To enhance access by underserved populations, LAAP requests course and program design that is accessible to those learners with disabilities as well as accommodating to other special populations.
- To create economies of scale that make it financially feasible to target underserved learners, LAAP supports the expansion of geographical and institutional boundaries so that courses, faculty, development costs, and network facilities can be shared.
- To address quality issues, LAAP encourages mechanisms for ensuring that educational providers, employers, and students have confidence that the degree or certificate will provide competencies needed for careers and further education.
- To address workforce development needs, LAAP helps to coordinate the needs of employers and the requirement of further education with the services of educational providers.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- LAAP is the Department's only technology program that aims to change how postsecondary institutions provide distance learning—creating new large-scale partnerships, resulting in cost-effectiveness, quality, and further access to underserved adult learners. Outside of ED, LAAP is working with the Department of Labor to ensure that the America's Learning Exchange includes listings of those programs and courses developed by LAAP partnerships. Within ED, LAAP works directly with the Distance Education Demonstration Program—a program that complements LAAP by offering institutions or consortia experimental waivers of restrictive Federal financial aid policies that are barriers to students enrolling in distance education. LAAP also communicates with Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology (a program that trains a new generation of public school teachers to effectively incorporate technologies into their teaching) on review processes, readers and postsecondary faculty development issues. LAAP also communicates with the Community Technology Centers regarding those applicants that are local and community-based, thus fitting within the Technology Centers' strategy of providing access to those in underserved communities seeking education or training. The Department's other technology initiatives—the Technology Challenge grants, Star Schools, and the like—are intended to support school reform and do not focus on postsecondary education. Still, regular communication across all these technology programs helps ensure that LAAP awards are made within a context of regional, state, and local efforts. LAAP is unique in promoting quality and innovation in postsecondary distance learning.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- Since FY 2000 appropriations fell short of the Department's request, this year's awards will be drastically reduced; thus, there will be fewer projects than originally planned and some diminution of the program's impact on the field of postsecondary distance learning.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Objectives 4, 5, and 6 were added.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.1 and 3.1 were dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Objective 1 changed, as did its Indicator 1.1.
- Objective 2 changed wording, as did its Indicator 2.1.
- Objective 3 changed its wording.

Dropped

- Indicator 3.1 was dropped.

New

The Department recognizes that early indicators did not adequately measure program performance.

TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT GRANTS

Goal: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The three initiatives authorized under Title II support Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by providing competitive grants to states for comprehensive teacher quality reforms; by providing competitive grants to partnerships of districts and institutions of higher education for fundamental improvements in teacher education; and by providing competitive grants to states and partnerships for new strategies for reducing shortages of qualified teachers in high-need areas.

FY 2000—$98,000,000

FY 2001—$98,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE OF NEW TEACHERS BY FUNDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATE POLICIES THAT STRENGTHEN INITIAL LICENSING STANDARDS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATE OR LOCAL POLICIES/PROGRAMS THAT REDUCE THE NUMBER OF UNCERTIFIED TEACHERS.

Indicator 1.1 Teacher certification standards. State grantees: An external panel of experts will find that all states that use their grant to strengthen initial teacher certification standards will have implemented higher standards within 3 years of the grant award. Within 1 1/2 years of the grant award, these states will have demonstrated progress toward implementation of higher standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge because no 1999 data are available.	**Sources:** State Report Card on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001.
1999:	**This is a new program for 1999.**	**New program**	However, based on a review of state grantee applications, 23 states indicated in their applications that they are in the process of reforming teacher certification standards, with either recent improvements made or intended improvements.	Annual program performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
2000:		100%	The quality of these reforms is unknown; also unknown is whether grantees will actually carry out their intended reforms.	National Evaluation. *Frequency:* Two updates. *Next Update:* 2002.
2001:		100%	**Explanation:** This is a new program, so actual performance data are not yet available. (Examples of "progress toward implementation of higher standards" include establishment of a standards committee, state legislative action on standards, or development of draft standards.)	**Validation Procedures:** Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
2002:		100%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees; State Report Card will contain self-reported data from states.

Indicator 1.2 Certification rate. State, recruitment, and partnership grantees: The percentages of new and current teachers who meet their state's teacher certification requirements, including passing content knowledge and competency tests, will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data. Unable to judge.	**Sources:** State Report Card on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2001.
1999:	**This is a new program for 1999.**	**New program**	**Explanation:** This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	
2000:		New program		Annual program performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
2001:		New program		National Evaluation. *Frequency:* One update. *Next Update:* 2003.
				Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees. State Report Card will contain self-reported data from states.

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY, PLACEMENT, AND RETENTION RATES OF WELL-PREPARED, HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS IN HIGH-NEED SCHOOLS.

Indicator 2.1 Placement and retention. Partnership and recruitment grantees: There will be an increase each year in the percentage of graduates from teacher preparation programs with partnership or recruitment grants who serve for at least 3 years in high-need schools, particularly high-poverty schools in partnership districts.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data. Unable to judge.	**Sources:** Annual program performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**This is a new program for 1999.**	**New program**	**Explanation:** This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	
2000:		New program		National Evaluation. *Frequency:* One update. *Next Update:* 2003.
2001:		New program		
				Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.

Indicator 2.2 Support for new teachers. Partnership and recruitment grantees: The percentage of new teachers in districts with partnerships or recruitment grants who receive ongoing support services and education from their grant program for at least their first 3 years of teaching will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data on actual grantee performance are available. However, based on a review of recruitment grantee applications, 11 recruitment grantees indicated that they offered support services to new teachers *prior to* receiving Title II funds in 1999. Based on a review of recruitment grantee applications, all 28 recruitment grantees proposed providing support services as a component of their Title II grant; these services include mentoring, professional development, and induction programs. Based on a review of partnership grantee applications, all 25 partnership grantees proposed providing support services as components of their Title II grant; these services include professional development, mentoring, and peer networks. **Explanation:** This is a new program, so actual performance data are not yet available.	**Sources:** Annual program performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. National Evaluation. *Frequency:* Two updates. *Next Update:* 2002. **Validation Procedures:** Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
1999:	**This is a new program for 1999.**	**New program**		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		

OBJECTIVE 3: IMPROVE THE ACADEMIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL TRAINING OF FUTURE TEACHERS.

Indicator 3.1 Content knowledge and teaching skills. Partnership and recruitment grantees: The percentage of graduates from teacher preparation programs with partnership or recruitment grants who demonstrate strong content knowledge and teaching skills in the subject they teach will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data. Unable to judge.	**Sources**: Annual program performance reports.
1999:	**This is a new program for 1999.**	**New program**		*Frequency*: Annually.
2000:		New program	**Explanation:** This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	*Next Update*: 2000.
2001:		New program		
2001:		New program		National Evaluation.
				Frequency: One update.
				Next Update: 2003.

Indicator 3.2 Technological skills. Partnership and state grantees: The percentage of teachers from partnership programs and grantee states who are prepared to integrate technology into the classroom will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data.	**Sources:** Annual program performance reports.
1999:	**This is a new program for 1999.**	**New program**		*Frequency*: Annually.
2000:		New program	**Explanation:** This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	*Next Update*: 2000.
2001:		New program		
				National Evaluation.
				Frequency: One update.
				Next Update: 2003.
				Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.

OBJECTIVE 4: IMPROVE THE ABILITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS TO CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVE THEIR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS AND MEET THE STAFFING NEEDS OF PARTNER DISTRICTS.

Indicator 4.1 Process of self-assessment and improvement. Partnership and recruitment grantees: The percentage of teacher preparation programs with partnership and recruitment grants that have a formal process for assessing the effectiveness of their graduates as classroom teachers will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No 1999 data on actual grantee performance are available.	**Sources:** Annual program performance reports.
1999:	**This is a new program for 1999.**	**New program**		*Frequency*: Annually.
2000:		New program		*Next Update*: 2000.
2001:		New program	However, based on a review of recruitment grantee applications, eight recruitment grantees indicated they had a formal assessment process in place prior to receiving Title II funds.	
				National Evaluation.
				Frequency: Two updates.
				Next Update: 2002.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Based on a review of recruitment grantee applications, 19 recruitment grantees indicated they would develop an assessment process as part of their Title II activities; assessment activities include written or oral evaluation of teachers' work, student achievement data, and interviews with supervisors. Based on a review of partnership applications, 23 partnership grantees indicated they will develop an assessment process as part of their Title II activities; assessment activities include evaluations by other educators, student achievement data, INTASC standards, and teachers' portfolios. **Explanations:** This is a new program, so actual program performance data are not yet available.	**Validation Procedures:** Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.

Indicator 4.2 Collaboration among partners. Partnership grantees: The percentage of partnership grantees with a governance structure that conducts a formal assessment of the staffing needs of local districts, monitors the effectiveness of partnership activities, and provides funds to partnership members for new activities will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Grantees have a collaborative structure in place.			**Status:** Progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** A high number of partnership grantees indicate in their program applications that they are currently undertaking many of the components of effective partnership collaboration.	**Sources:** Annual program performance reports. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. National Evaluation. *Frequency:* Two updates. *Next Update:* 2002. **Validation Procedures:** Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Baseline data from applications are self-reported and may reflect *intended* program activities, not *actual* program activities. Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**100%***	**New programs**		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		
Grantees have a formal needs assessment process in place.				
1999:	**88%***	**New programs**		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		
Grantees monitor the effectiveness of partnership activities.				
1999:	**96%***	**New programs**		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		
Grantees provide increasing funds to partnership members for new activities.				
1999:	**24%***	**New programs**		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		

* Baseline data

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

To expand grantee awareness of promising practices and increase the pace of change in teacher education reform, the Title II Program will disseminate information to grantees and prospective grantees in the following areas:

- Strategies that some states have used to improve certification standards, reduce the number of uncertified teachers, and hold teacher training programs accountable for training highly skilled teachers.
- Upcoming awards program for teacher education programs and the lessons learned from the award winners. For example, learn how the programs measure the effectiveness of their graduates.
- Ways in which the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology, and other related programs can be used to support the program goals.
- Best practices in the field.
- Teaching opportunities for students and recent graduates.

To meet grantee and program performance goals, including comprehensive reform of teacher preparation programs, improved teacher recruitment practices and stronger state licensure systems, the Title II Program will provide technical assistance and facilitate communication among grantees through the following means:

- Sponsoring activities such as focus groups, conferences, or workshops where participating partners can exchange information and ideas to enhance the success of the program.
- Sponsoring workshops to help grantees coordinate with the Eisenhower Professional Development Program.
- Providing technical assistance to partnerships in the development of assessment instruments.
- Helping grantee institutions share information on effective strategies.

To base program and grantee work on the best research and the best practices, the Title II Program will coordinate with other programs and organizations, such as:

- The National Science Foundation's teacher preparation programs and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's teacher preparation activities.
- The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the National Governor's Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the American Council on Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the State Higher Educational Executive Officers, and other organizations, to promote program goals.
- ED's Office of Postsecondary Education programs: Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology and Gear Up, and ED's Office of Vocational Education's teacher education initiative.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Coordination includes involving NASA's teacher preparation program grantees in technical assistance and dissemination activities with Title II grantees, starting with the first Title II project directors' conference. Coordination efforts will also involve the teacher preparation programs run through the National Science Foundation.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The capability of the Title II office to provide extensive technical assistance to grant recipients.
- The ability of grant recipients to
  - develop leadership support in their states or on campuses,
  - build broad collaborative partnerships with key stakeholders, and
  - develop strategies to sustain the project after Federal funding ends.

Grant recipients must overcome decades of neglect for teacher preparation programs among campus leaders such as presidents, provosts, and members of the arts and sciences community. Securing the personal involvement of these leaders for the restructuring of teacher preparation programs is a crucial but often difficult task to achieve. The support and involvement of campus leaders in teacher preparation programs is a precondition to policy and practice changes (such as changing faculty expectations or creating a faculty reward system). It is also a necessary precondition for obtaining financial support that ensures that high-quality teacher preparation becomes a university-wide priority and remains a priority after Federal Title II funding ends.

- Ensuring sustained political and public interest in and support of the Title II programs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 (state and local assessments) was modified for FY 2000. The FY 2000 indicator remains unchanged in FY 20001, except for its number, which is described above.
- Indicator 1.2 (NAEP reading and math) was modified for FY 2000 to target performance of the lowest achieving students and students in the highest poverty public schools as well as being renumbered as Indicator 1.1 (a shared indicator with Goals 2000). The FY 2001 indicator remains the same as FY 2000.
- Indicator 2.2 (standards and assessments) was modified by dropping the assessment indicator and including in standards piece in FY 2000 Indicator 2.1 (use of challenging standards) FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) brings back the FY 99 assessment piece that had been dropped in FY 2000.
- Indicator 2.3 (research-based curriculum and instruction) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.4.
- Indicator 2.4 (extended learning time) was slightly modified in FY 2000 and numbered as Indicator 2.3.
- Indicator 2.5 (services to private school students) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.7 to delete "more effective communication, consultation, and services" and substitute with "effective implementation of on-site services to students." For FY 2001, the indicator has been dropped as described above.
- Indicator 3.2 (qualified teacher aides) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.6 to shift the focus from credentials to district support for the educational improvement through career ladders for paraprofessionals and aides. FY 2001 Indicator 2.5 retains the FY 2000 indicator and expands to include qualified staff in Title I schools.
- Indicator 4.1 (implementing high standards) was slightly modified as FY 2000 Indicator 3.1(Establishing annual progress measures) and dropped in FY 2001.
- Indicator 4.2 (linked assessments) was modified slightly in FY 2000 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) and substantially maintained as FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments).
- Indicator 4.3 (accountability: monitoring, intervention and assistance) was significantly changed in FY 2000 indicator to assess only the provision of "effective assistance to schools not making progress through school support teams and other sources." The FY 2001 Indicator 3.3 remains the same as FY 2000 but has been expanded to include public school enrollment options as described above.
- Indicator 5.1 (school-parent compacts) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 to delete "school staff and parents will report" and replace it with "Title I participating schools will report." The FY 2001 Indicator 2.3 has been changed to reflect a broader assessment of the effectiveness of parental involvement programs.
- Indicator 5.2 (improved attendance and homework completion) was not included in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 but used instead as performance data.

Dropped

- None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Several indicators have been combined since last year to reduce the overall number of indicators. The purpose of this adjustment was to combine indicators from last year's plan that were similar to each other into one indicator for the FY 2001 plan.
- The following changes were made: former Indicators 1.3, 3.1, and 6.1 were combined to Indicator 1.2 for the FY 2001 plan; former Indicators 3.2, 3.3, and 6.3 were combined to Indicator 2.1 in the FY 2001 plan; and former Indicators 2.1 and 6.2 were combined to Indicator 2.2 for the FY 2001 plan.
- The wording of several indicators was slightly adjusted, and the indicators were given new numbers; in the FY 2001 plan, these are Indicators 3.2, 4.1, and 4.2.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.2 was dropped since last year's plan. This indicator was a process indicator, measuring enrollment in academic courses, rather than an outcome indicator.

New — None

UNDERGROUND RAILROAD PROGRAM

Goal: To promote the research, display, interpretation, and collection of artifacts relating to the history of the Underground Railroad and to make the interpretive efforts available to institutions of higher education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 by helping to ensure the high quality of educational programs through efforts to increase awareness of the history of the Underground Railroad.

FY 2000—$1,750,000

FY 2001—$1,750,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ASSIST NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN BUILDING PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND CREATING ENDOWMENT FUNDS TO SUPPORT MUSEUM OPERATIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Increased awareness: Ten Underground Railroad Web sites will be linked within the United States.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program; no performance data yet available.	**Sources:** Program data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2001.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		No target set		
FY 2001:		10 linked sites	**Explanation:** This is a new program. Early meetings of focus groups indicate interest in broadening understanding and increasing collaboration via the Web, but it is too early to determine if target will be met.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

Indicator 1.2 Fundraising initiatives: Private sector support will increase by 20 percent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New program; no performance data yet available.	**Sources:** Program data. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2001.
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
FY 2000:		Baseline to be established		
FY 2001:		20% increase	**Explanation:** This is a new program.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- The National Underground Railroad Freedom Center, the City University of New York, and the Harriet Tubman Home will work together to target Underground Railroad (URR) stations to be linked in order to build a compatible electronic infrastructure. The Freedom Center, the City University of New York, and the Harriet Tubman Home also will work together to prepare publications and hold focus groups to broaden understanding of the Underground Railroad. This is a new program; this key strategy is just being implemented.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To increase awareness of the Underground Railroad, through planning, research, and architectural documentation, the Harriet Tubman Home will be restored.
- To ensure participation by qualifying partnerships, the Underground Railroad will be publicized through conferences, workshops, and seminars.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- This program will work with the National Park Service to refine performance standards and strategies to improve museum operations of Underground Railroad stations within the United States.
- The Department of Education will seek expertise within the National Park Service to assist project directors of funded projects in networking with key individuals who are knowledgeable about Underground Railroad stations throughout the United States.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- This is a new program. The technological infrastructures for this program are yet to be developed. The project directors will meet to discuss, explore, and hopefully resolve issues of platform compatibility across systems throughout the United States.
- Evaluation strategies need further refinement to determine exactly what will be assessed for measuring the success of this effort

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2, which stated that "funds be provided in a timely manner," has been dropped because it does not adequately reflect a performance measure.

New

- Indicator 1.2 has been added to address fundraising initiatives.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GPRA DATA/EVALUATION PROGRAM

Goal: To improve the type and quality of information available about the performance of the postsecondary education programs funded by the Department of Education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports all objectives in Goal 3 (to ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning) by providing data on program performance for the postsecondary education programs that support these objectives.
FY 2000—$3,000,000
FY 2001—$3,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: TO FUND STUDIES AND DATA COLLECTIONS NEEDED TO ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF THE DEPARTMENT'S POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Indicator 1.1 Improved data on performance: Significant improvement will be made in the quality of data available to measure the performance of the postsecondary programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Decisions are currently being made regarding program areas to be focused on first.	**Sources:** Review of Department efforts. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**No data available**	**Not applicable, program not funded**		
2000:		Significant improvement in the quality of available data.	**Explanation:** No data available; program just received funding.	**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure but will describe data collection efforts in sufficient detail so that outside reviewers can independently judge the quality of data obtained.
2001:		Significant improvement in the quality of available data.		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.

KEY STRATEGIES

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Identify areas in postsecondary education where additional GPRA or evaluative information is needed by reviewing congressional testimony, questions, and General Accounting Office and Office of the Inspector General reports. Conduct well-designed, efficient data collection efforts and studies to obtain the needed information.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Is currently working with the Internal Revenue Service and Social Security Administration to obtain income data needed for the Student Financial Assistance Policy measures.
- Where possible, will coordinate data collection efforts with other agencies, such as Census or the National Science Foundation.
- Will utilize and possibly augment existing National Center for Education Statistics data collection efforts.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- It may be difficult to assess the impact of many of the postsecondary education programs because of the inability to establish a reasonable control group against which to compare the outcomes of the program participants. In addition, many of the programs are relatively small, meaning that any sort of rigorous evaluation study could easily amount to a sizable percentage of the program.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—Not applicable.

Dropped—Not applicable.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

❖ Indicator 1.1 was modified to incorporate the quality of the data collection efforts rather than just their existence.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by assisting Howard University in its mission to serve disadvantaged students by providing a high-quality education.

FY 2000—$219,444,000

FY 2001—$224,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND ACHIEVEMENT BY (1) RECRUITING BETTER STUDENTS, (2) IMPROVING STUDENT RETENTION, (3) IMPROVING GRADUATION RATES, AND (4) PROMOTING EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING.

Indicator 1.1 Better students: The average SAT scores of incoming freshman will increase by 1 percent per year.

Targets and Performance Data

Average SAT score

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	
	Math	Verbal	Total	% change	Total	% change
1997:	513	494	1007			
1998:	519	506	1025	1.8		
1999:	**533**	**517**	**1050**	**2.4**	**1035**	**1**
2000:					1055	0.5
2001:					1060	0.5
2002:					1065	0.5

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded.

Explanation: Average SAT scores increased from 1025 in 1998 to 1050 in 1999, resulting in a 2.4 percent increase, well above the target of a 1 percent increase. The new objective is to increase average SAT scores by 0.5 percent per year.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Howard University.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: No formal validation procedure used.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 1.2 Student retention: Decrease attrition for undergraduate FTIC (first time in college) students by 2 percent until national average is bettered.

Targets and Performance Data

Attrition rates

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	National Rate	HU Rate	
1996-97:	26.7%	17.0%	
1997-98:	26.4%	15.1%	
1998-99:	**25.0%**	**16.0%**	Continuing decrease
1999-00:			15%
2000-01:			14%
2001-02:			13%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target of bettering the national average achieved.

Explanation: The attrition rate of 16 percent at Howard University is well below the national average of 25 percent. The new objective is to decrease the attrition rate by 1 percent per year.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Howard University.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: No formal validation procedure used.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: None.

Indicator 1.3 Graduation rates: The undergraduate and graduate graduation rates will increase by 2 percent per year until the national average is reached or exceeded.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
6-year graduation rate				**Status:** Target achieved. **Explanation:** The graduation rate at Howard University of 46 percent, although somewhat below the national average, improved from the previous year's graduation rate of 41 percent.	**Source:** Howard University. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** NCES national 6-year graduation rates are not yet available. However, the reported 6-year national rate comes from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange at the University of Oklahoma. Howard University is a member of the institution.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	National Rate	**HU Rate**			
1997:		49.0%			
1998:		40.9%			
1999:	**54.2%**	**46.1%**	**43%**		
2000:			48%		
2001:			50%		
2002:			52%		

Indicator 1.4 Excellence in teaching and scholarship: The participation rate of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Proposals						**Status:** Target met. **Explanation:** The principal goal for the Fund for Academic Excellence is to be a catalyst for increasing extramural research. Enhanced standards for faculty extramural repeat awards will ultimately constrain the participation rate for faculty.	**Source:** Howard University. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**			
	Submitted	**Funded**	**Number of Participants**	**To Be Funded**	**Number of Participants**		
1998:	258	153	189				
1999:	**218**	**152**	**200**	**Continued increase**	**Continued increase**		
2000:				125	210		
2001:				155	220		
2002:				158	231		

OBJECTIVE 2: TO PROMOTE EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH.

Indicator 2.1 Grants received: The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
			Status: Target achieved. **Explanation:** Funded grant proposals continued to increase in 1999.	**Source:** Howard University. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	232			
1998:	279			
1999:	**299**	**Continued increase**		
2000:		301		
2001:		304		
2002:		307		

Indicator 2.2 Grant funding: The total funds received through research grants will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		**Status:** Target achieved.	**Source:** Howard University.
	Value of Grants Received	**% Change**	**Value of Grants Received**	**% Change**	**Explanation:** Receipt of over $47 million in research grants in 1999 demonstrates improvement in obtaining research grant funding.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1997:	$45,268,427					**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
1998:	$44,057,827	–2.7				
1999:	**$47,533,841**	**7.9**	**Continuing increase**			**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
2000:			$48,009,180	20% over 1997		
2001:			$48,489,272			
2002:			$48,974,165			

OBJECTIVE 3: INCREASE HOWARD UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL STRENGTH AND INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Indicator 3.1 Endowment: The value of the endowment each year will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Market value of endowment			**Status:** Target achieved.	**Source:** Howard University.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** The market value of Howard University's endowment increased 17 percent in 1999, from $253 million to $297 million.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1997:	$211.2 million			**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
1998:	$252.9 million			
1999:	**$297.0 million**	**Continuing increase**		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
2000:		$320 million		
2001:		$346 million		

Indicator 3.2 Outside support: The funds raised from all private sources will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Alumni contribution			**Status:** Target achieved.	**Source:** Howard University.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Outside support increased to $9.2 million in 1999.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1997:	$11.8 million			**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
1998:	$8.4 million			
1999:	**$9.2 million**	**Continuing increase**		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
2000:		$11.0 million		
2001:		$14.5 million		
2002:		$18.0 million		

Indicator 3.3 Outside support—alumni: The participation rate of alumni who contribute to the school will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Participation rate			**Status:** Did not meet target.	**Source:** Howard University.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** The 9.4 percent participation rate is below the desired goal. The university's fundraising operations have been completely restructured to ensure greater congruence with the goals.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
1998:	11.4%			**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
1999:	**9.4%**	**Continuing increase**		
2000:		25.0%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
2001:		30.0%		
2002:		32.0%		

Indicator 3.4 Cost savings at the Howard University Hospital: The difference between the hospital's net revenue (excluding Federal appropriations) and total expenses will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Net Revenue		Total Expense		**Status:** Did not meet target.	**Source:** Howard University.
	Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1997:	$170,084,807		$209,761,348		**Explanation:** The difference between the hospital's net revenue and total expenses ($204,360,845 and $234,841,266) results in a slightly higher deficit of $30.5 million from the previous year's deficit of $27.9 million. Changes in net revenue brought about by managed health care, coupled with uncompensated health care to indigenous populations, made achievements of the goal in this period unattainable.	*Next Update:* 2000.
1998:	$183,789,977		$211,689,178			**Validation Procedure:** No formal validation procedure used.
1999:	**$204,360,845**		**$234,841,266**			
2000:		$184,510,111		$225,813,215		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
2001:		$193,735,617		$237,103,876		
2002:		$203,422,397		$248,959,070		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Recruit good students by targeting high-ability students in schools across the country; by convening summer high school counselors in a symposium and honors student weekend; by encouraging alumni to identify and contact high-ability students; and by expanding publicity on student leaders and achievers, as well as outstanding programs.
- Increase retention and graduation rates by improving orientation programs; by replacing the Mid-term Deficiency Report with a Midterm Status Report to alert all undergraduate students of their standing at midterm; by continuing regular assessment of students' academic standings; by convening faculty adviser workshops; and by providing written correspondence to faculty on retention goals and issues.
- Implement degree adult program.
- Expand research support by improving postaward grant administration and faculty support by the Office of Research Administration; by conducting faculty workshops on "how to win grants and contracts"; by increasing the distribution of grant announcements; and by installing computer workstations for all full-time faculty.
- Continue to monitor external money managers who invest Howard's endowment fund to ensure continued healthy returns.
- Improve fundraising by conducting a national media campaign with articles in national publications (e.g., the New York Times, Washington Post, Christian Science Monitor, Chronicle of Higher Education) featuring Howard University; by intensifying and broadening the direct mail campaign; by inaugurating an annual fund campaign and a systematic program of communication with alumni; by continuing to manage to contain costs; by continuing marketing efforts to feature recent improvements in equipment and service; and by undertaking a long-term strategic planning effort spearheaded by a special committee from the Howard University Board of Trustees.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Efforts under this initiative are coordinated with the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Title III.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- There are a number of factors beyond the control of Howard University that can affect student recruitment, retention, and graduation rates.
- Marketwide stock market fluctuations significantly influence endowment growth.
- Finally, economic conditions and changes in the health care industry also potentially affect Howard University's efforts toward fiscal independence of the University Hospital.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS (NCES) STATISTICS AND ASSESSMENT

Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is working to comply with Objective 4.1 (our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products); and Objective 4.3 (an up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equality). NCES actions that link its program objectives to the Department's Strategic Objectives 4.1 and 4.3 are presented on pages 4 and 5 (strategy 1: Actions that will be or are being taken by NCES to accomplish its FY 2000 program plan goals and objectives).

FY 2000—$108,000,000

FY 2001—$126,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDES TIMELY, USEFUL, AND COMPREHENSIVE DATA THAT ARE RELEVANT TO POLICY AND EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT.

Indicator 1.1 Customer satisfaction: At least 85 percent of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90 percent in FY 2001 will agree that National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are timely, relevant, and comprehensive.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications					**Status:** The overall NCES customer satisfaction rating is 90 percent, which meets performance target. NCES continues to show improvement in all areas of its performance data. Between 1997 and 1999 NCES focused on improving the timeliness of its publications and data files. Significant progress was made in the Common Core of Data (CCD) Reports and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). CCD's last School and Agency Report shows an improvement from 25 months to 15 months from data collection to publication and a 3-month improvement in State Nonfiscal. NAEP has shown dramatic improvements in timeliness for many of its major reports. Science has improved from 23 to 12 months; long-term trends from 29 to 14 months; reading from 17 to 10 months; and math from 12 to 10 months. In addition, NAEP has also begun the practice of releasing simultaneous Web data files and reports.	**Source:** NCES 1997 and 1999 Customer Satisfaction Survey (next survey: FY 2001). *Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* January 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data was validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** There are no data limitations, but NCES will try to schedule its future collection of customer data to match the Department's program plan reporting schedule. Note: Data from the 1999 Customer Service Survey are preliminary data subject to a final review.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility			
1997:	88%	72%	86%			
1998:	No data available	No data available	No data available			
1999:	**91%**	**77%**	**89%**	**90%**		
2000:				No target set		
2001:				90%		
Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES data files						
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness				
1997:	82%	52%				
1998:	No data available	No data available				
1999:	**87%**	**67%**		**90%**		
2000:				No target set		
2001:				90%		

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility			
1997:	No data available	89%	No data available			
1998:	No data available	No data available	No data available			
1999:	**No data available**	**93%**	**93%**	**90%**		
2000:				No target set		
2001:				90%		

OBJECTIVE 2: COLLECT HIGH-QUALITY DATA.

Indicator 2.1 Customer rating of quality: At least 85 percent of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90 percent in FY 2001 will agree that NCES data is of high quality in terms of accuracy, reliability, validity, and comprehensiveness.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications				**Status:** NCES met its 1999 performance goals with an overall quality ranking or 93 percent for publications and 87 percent for data files. NCES did not meet its 1999 performance goal of 85 percent in accuracy. **Explanation:** NCES achieved a 90 percent overall customer satisfaction rating in 1997 and has made that percentage its performance target for future years.	**Source:** NCES 1999 Customer Satisfaction Survey (next survey: FY 2001). *Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* January 2001. **Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES statistical standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Same as 1.1.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	Accuracy	Overall quality			
1997:	No data available	90%			
1998:	No data available	No data available			
1999:	**84%**	**93%**	**90%**		
2000:			No target set		
2001:			90%		
Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES data files					
	Accuracy	Overall Quality			
1997:	74%	No data available			
1998:	No data available	No data available			
1999:	**82%**	**87%**	**90%**		
2000:			No target set		
2001:			90%		

755

754

OBJECTIVE 3: DEVELOP PUBLICATIONS THAT ARE EASY TO READ, USEFUL, AND OF HIGH OVERALL QUALITY.

Indicator 3.1 Ease of reading: At least 85 percent of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90 percent in FY 2001 will agree that NCES publications are easy to read.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
	Clarity of Writing	Useful to Work	Overall Quality	
1997:	87%	86%	90%	
1998:	No data available	No data available	No data available	
1999:	**90%**	**89%**	**93%**	**90%**
2000:				**No target set**
2001:				90%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded.

Explanation: NCES improved in performance in all areas of this objective and surpassed its goal of establishing a 90 percent overall quality ranking.

NCES achieved a 90 percent overall customer satisfaction level in 1997 and has made that percentage the performance target for future years.

Baseline performance data for all NCES objectives represent results from the NCES 1997 Customer Satisfaction Survey and will include biennial update.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: 3.1-3.3 NCES 1997 & 1999 Customer Satisfaction Survey (next survey: FY 2001).
Frequency: Biennially.
Next Update: January 2001.

In FY 1999 NCES again measured customer satisfaction rates. This survey was a follow-up to the FY 1997 survey that established NCES baseline performance data. Also, in FY 1999 and FY 2000 NCES will conduct focus group discussions with targeted customers, including policy makers, researchers, and practitioners.

Other sources of feedback: Biannual input from NCES Advisory Council; biennial NCES customer survey in 1997 and 1999.

Validation Procedure: By NCES review procedures and NCES statistical standards.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same as 1.1.

Indicator 3.2 Utility: At least 85 percent of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90 percent in FY 2001 will rate NCES publications as useful to their work.

Targets and Performance Data

NCES customers who responded as satisfied or very satisfied with the usefulness of NCES publications

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	86%	
1998:	No data available	
1999:	**89%**	**90%**
2000:		**No target set**
2001:		90%

Assessment of Progress

Status: 1999 Customer Data will be available in spring 2000.

Explanation: NCES has achieved an 86 percent rating and we have a performance target of 90 percent for future years.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Same as Indicator 3.1.

Validation Procedure: Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES statistical standards.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: See 1.1.

756

757

Indicator 3.3 Publication Quality: At least 85 percent of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90 percent in FY 2001 will express satisfaction with the overall quality of NCES publications.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of NCES customers who indicated their overall satisfaction rate with the overall quality of publications			**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Source:** Same as Indicator 3.1.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** NCES has achieved a 90 percent rating in 1997 and will use that percentage for a future performance target level.	**Validation Procedure:** Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES statistical standards.
1997:	90%			
1998:	No data available			
1999:	**93%**	**90%**		
2000:		No target set	In 1999, NCES surpassed its previous rating by 3 percent with a new high rating of 93 percent.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** See 1.1
2001:		90%		

KEY STRATEGIES

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is pursing two types of strategies: (a) listing the strategies that will be used to accomplish the goals and objectives of the FY 2000 Program Plan; and (b) identifying the strategies that will be used to link program objectives to the Department's Strategic Plan (objectives noted in parentheses).

Strategies Continued from 1999

Data Collection:

- National Center for Education Statistics will continue to conduct focus group discussions with key customers and targeted surveys to assess and improve the timeliness, relevance, and comprehensiveness of its data (Objective 1.1). **On-going**
- National Center for Education Statistics customer surveys will continue to rely on a core set of questions that will be administered to a representative sample of persons in successive years for use in reporting against performance measures (Objective 1.1, 2.1, 3.1-3.3). **On-going**
- National Center for Education Statistics will develop new questions that will be added to customer surveys to solicit information for program improvement purposes (as above). **On-going**
- National Center for Education Statistics is currently working on program redesign activities for the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), and its International Program (Objective 2.1). **In progress**
- National Center for Education Statistics is developing a new early childhood survey (Objective 1.1). **In progress**
- National Center for Education Statistics is involved in a number of collaborative Interagency Agreement activities that will improve data availability and quality on topical educational issues including school safety and health issues with the Department of Justice, Census Bureau, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Agriculture, and other principal offices in ED. **On-going**
- National Center for Education Statistics will conduct an internal analysis of processing times for its major data collections in an effort to improve timeliness. This improvement effort is expected to be completed June 1999. **National Center for Education Statistics is reviewing the November Draft Report and comparing the findings with the 1999 survey results. Areas where the National Center for Education Statistics has shown dramatic improvements in timeliness for Common Core of Data and National Association of Education Process are reflected in Objective 1.1.**
- National Center for Education Statistics will coordinate with the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), and conduct a customer satisfaction survey of state education agencies in FY 1999 to determine the feasibility and projected burden reduction of collecting data on students with disabilities through a single coordinated survey. **Completed and being pilot tested.**
- National Center for Education Statistics will coordinate with the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) in FY 1999 a pilot project testing the electronic collection of a coordinated state level report, and will build an integrated file accessible to multiple departmental users. **Office of Management has taken the lead on this project and has developed a prototype system.**
- National Center for Education Statistics will lead states and other principal operating components (POCs) in a review and update of the student, staff, and discipline data handbooks to secure consensus on standard definitions in FY 1999. **Student handbook has been revised and task force of states is working with National Center for Education Statistics to revise the format on crime and violence reporting.**
- National Center for Education Statistics will provide the Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) with our statistical standards for dissemination to other departmental POCs. **Completed**
- National Center for Education Statistics will participate in a future Planning and Evaluation Service workgroup to help improve the Department's Data Quality Standards. **Completed**
- National Center for Education Statistics will provide technical consultation to principal operating components on future major data collection efforts. **On-going**

KEY STRATEGIES CONTINUED

New or Strengthened Strategies

- National Center for Education Statistics continues to look for new ways to improve its overall quality, timeliness, and improved distribution of information and service to its customers. We have recently added the simultaneous release of Web-based data files with National Assessment of Educational Progress reports, and we continue to explore new ways to use the Web to better serve our clients.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- National Center for Education Statistics is involved in a number of collaborative interagency agreement activities with Census, Health and Human Services, Justice, Agriculture, and other ED principal offices.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The challenges facing the National Center for Education Statistics are financial in nature, due to limited appropriations for continuing the full range of data collection with increasing authorizations.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Any indicators that relied on 2000 annual survey data were modified to rely on a 2001 annual survey. Because of a lack of funds, there will not be a 2000 survey.

Dropped—None.

New—None.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION

NATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH INSTITUTES

Goal: Conduct high-quality research and development that contribute to educational improvement.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The National Education Research Institutes support Objective 4.3 (an up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity) by funding the conduct and distribution of rigorous research that addresses critical education issues.

FY 2000—$84,782,000

FY 2001—Funds for the National Education Research Institutes program are being requested under the Research, Development, and Dissemination Program. The total FY 2001 request is $198,567,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: THE FINDINGS AND PRODUCTS OF EDUCATION RESEARCH ARE USEFUL TO POLICY MAKERS AND PRACTITIONERS IN ADDRESSING THEIR HIGH-PRIORITY NEEDS.

Indicator 1.1 Usefulness: Education policy makers and practitioners find research products supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) to be useful in addressing their high-priority needs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
As a part of the renewal process, an expert review panel found the scope and focus of the next 5 years of work proposed by the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk to be useful in addressing the high-priority needs of at-risk students			**Status:** Available data do not allow us to actually measure progress. Indicators have been revised to develop targets and performance data that more accurately reflect and measure progress. **Explanation:** Beginning this year, a representative group of education policy makers and practitioners will judge a sample of products supported by research funds from OERI on their responsiveness and usefulness. Baseline data and performance goals will be established by the next report.	**Source:** OERI staff are developing an inventory from which to draw a sample of products. A contractor will develop and draw the sample. Reviewers will be drawn from a variety of education organizations, states, and school districts. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No data to validate. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Available data do not measure progress. Revised strategies and data sources are explained below.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Baseline data will be established		
2001:		Will be based on FY 2000 baseline data		

Indicator 1.2 OERI-supported research findings are published in periodicals for education practitioners and policy makers.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Four key findings from the National Center for Early Development and Learning's national survey of kindergarten teachers were recently published by Elementary School Journal. The September 1999 article was titled "Kindergarten Teachers' Practices Related to Transition to School: Results of a National Survey." In the November 1999 edition of School Administrator a project director at the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing offered guidance on key considerations for schools in crafting accountability report cards. The article "Creating School Accountability Reports" included findings from the center's examination of different report card representations. Each edition of Change magazine, published by the American Association for Higher Education, includes a special pullout section about research on higher education being conducted by the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement. This prominent and regular feature has covered a wide range of vital subjects, such as student assessment policies and practices, improvement of postsecondary remediation, the market structure of higher education, and transitions from college to work.	**Status:** Available data do not allow us to actually measure progress. Indicators have been revised to develop targets and performance data that more accurately reflect and measure progress. **Explanation:** Beginning this year, OERI will track the publication of OERI-supported research findings in a select set of periodicals for education practitioners and policy makers. Baseline data and performance goals will be established by the next report.	**Source:** A contractor will be employed to help OERI staff identify a set of publications and to review those publications for OERI-supported research findings. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No data to validate. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Available data do not measure progress. Revised strategies and data sources are explained below.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**
FY 2000:		Baseline data will be established
FY 2001:		Will be based on FY 2000 baseline data

OBJECTIVE 2: EDUCATION RESEARCH REFLECTS ACCEPTED STANDARDS OF TECHNICAL MERIT AND EVIDENCE.

Indicator 2.1 Technical Merit: Review panels find a sample of OERI-supported research products to reflect research of a fully acceptable scientific quality.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The overall assessment of each of the 10 interim peer reviews of research and development centers was positive. Reviewers praised the leadership of centers, the overall high quality of center research, and an intellectual climate that promotes successful work. As a part of the renewal process, an expert review panel found the proposal submitted by the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk for the next 5 years of work to be of fully acceptable scientific quality. The panel also made some recommendations that are being incorporated into the scope of work.	**Status:** Available data do not allow us to actually measure progress. Indicators have been revised to develop targets and performance data that more accurately reflect and measure progress. **Explanation:** Beginning this year, a panel of researchers will judge a sample of OERI-supported research products on the scientific quality. Baseline data and performance goals will be established by next report.	**Source:** OERI staff is developing an inventory from which to draw a sample of products. A contractor will develop and draw the sample. Reviewers will be drawn from a variety of research organizations, colleges, and universities. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No data to validate. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Available data do not measure progress. Revised strategies and data sources are explained below.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**
2000:		Baseline data will be established.
2001:		Will be based on FY 2000 baseline data

Indicator 2.2 OERI-supported research is published in scholarly research journals.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The article "School Membership in the National Network of Partnership Schools: Progress, Challenges and Next Steps" reported findings from research conducted at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk. It was published in a 1999 edition of The Journal Of Educational Research. The Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing and the National Center on Increasing the Effectiveness of State and Local Education Reform Efforts at the Consortium for Policy Research in Education were used as sources in the Education Writers Association Backgrounder 9 on state standards. The January 1999 edition of the Early Education and Development journal included an article on "Statistical Methods for Describing Developmental Patterns," written by a principal investigator at the National Center for Early Development and Learning. A large section of the June 1998 Phi Delta Kappan was devoted to issues concerning gifted and talented education. The work of the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented was used as a resource for the six articles in the magazine.	**Status:** Available data do not allow us to actually measure progress. Indicators have been revised to develop targets and performance data that more accurately reflect and measure progress. **Explanation:** Beginning this year, OERI will track the publication of OERI-supported research findings in a set of rigorously peer-reviewed research journals. Baseline data and performance goals will be established by next report.	**Source:** A contractor will be employed to help OERI staff identify a set of publications and to review those publications for OERI-supported research findings. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* December 2000. **Validation Procedure:** No data to validate. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Available data do not measure progress. Revised strategies and data sources are explained below.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**
FY 2000:		Baseline data will be established
FY 2001:		Will be based on FY 2000 baseline data

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) will continue to expand partnerships with other agencies such as the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- The Office of Educational Research and Improvement will strengthen internal research capacity by continuing to recruit visiting scholars through the National Academy of Sciences.
- External and internal quality reviews of products and activities of grantees and contractors following The Office of Educational Research and Improvement's Phase III performance standards will provide ongoing formative evaluation and adjustments to current programs of research.
- The Office of Educational Research and Improvement continues to work with its National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board on the development and implementation of a long-term research agenda.
- Accessible, up-to-date inventories of education research activities and products will be maintained.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- The Office of Educational Research and Improvement will work closely with the National Research Council to develop a plan for an expanded research program of large-scale, systemic experimentation and demonstration focused on strategic education issues.
- To ensure that the Office of Educational Research and Improvement continues to improve the usefulness of its research, it will pilot the use of external expert panels of prominent researchers to develop recommendations for a research agenda with a program/problem orientation that builds on and expands cumulative research-based knowledge.
- The Office of Educational Research and Improvement will undertake new activities to maximize the Federal investment in research and development related to comprehensive school reform by building more productive working relationships among Office of Educational Research and Improvement research staff and research and development contractors designed to foster collaborative and crosscutting research and evaluation activities.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- To assist in improving the scientific quality of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's research, the agency has developed partnerships with other agencies to develop, conduct, and manage grant and contracts programs addressing mutual high priority issues. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development have undertaken a new initiative to build a knowledge base for improving the literacy learning of English Language Learning Students. The Interagency Education Research Initiative (IERI) is an ongoing partnership between the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health designed to develop knowledge and experimental methods that will allow for the implementation and evaluation of large-scale educational interventions, which will, in turn, inform educational policy and practice. In order to improve math and science teaching and learning, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement is coordinating the replication of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study of eighth graders. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement is partnering with the National Science Foundation, as well as the 13 states and 14 school districts and consortia of districts that participated in the study as separate entities, to facilitate improved use of data and empirically based improvement strategies.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

None.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- The goal for the National Education Research Institutes was adjusted to focus more clearly on the actual work the agency manages. Both objectives were revised to reflect a more specific focus on outcome measures, and all indicators were adjusted to include more specific information about the sources to be used.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- In order to better quantify the measurement of progress, last years' Objective 1 has been revised to focus more specifically on "the findings and products of education research" rather than the more general "education research." For the same purpose, last years' Indicator 2.1 has been revised to indicate that panels will review "a sample of OERI supported research products," rather than "OERI supported research."
- Indicator 1.1 has been adjusted to address usefulness as well as high-priority needs. Further, it specifies that "education policy makers and practitioners" will judge the usefulness of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's research products, as opposed to an "expert panel."
- The use of periodical and journal citations as measurements has been dropped from both Indicator 1.2 and Indicator 2.2 of last year's plan. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement has determined that the universal counting of citations does not represent the usefulness or technical merit of research findings as effectively as the measurement of actual articles printed in a select group of publications.

Dropped

- Objective 3 (the findings and products of education research are useful to policy makers and practitioners) and Indicator 3.1 (expert panels find the Office of Educational Research and Improvement supported research to be useful to policy makers and practitioners) have been incorporated into this year's Objective 1, Indicator 1.1 (education policy makers and practitioners find research products supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement [OERI] to be useful in addressing their high-priority needs).

New

- Objective 3 addressing the usefulness of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's findings and products to policy makers and practitioners was added.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Explanation/Comments

- For each of the indicators, the target, performance measures and/or data sources have been revised to some extent. These revisions are based upon both the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's experience in unsuccessfully attempting to quantify performance with the previous measures, and upon a careful reconsideration of how best to both measure and improve the most critical aspects of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's performance.
- The Office of Educational Research and Improvement's experience this year has shown that many of the performance measures and data sources currently used will not, in fact, allow it to measure adequately progress toward meeting its critical objectives. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement's new system of expert panels did provide an overall assessment of the quality of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's research program and recommendations for improvements, but that system does not provide measures for gauging progress over time. Similarly, the more narrowly focused review panels employed to conduct interim reviews of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's Research and Development Centers did not provide data useful for the purposes of this report. Those reviews, formative in nature, are not conducted annually and do not provide measurement data. The usefulness of both the new system of expert panels and the more traditional review panels are therefore limited as measures in an ongoing performance based indicator system.
- After careful consideration, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement has determined that a revised set of performance measures is needed to provide useful information on the most critical aspects of its work. For example, the analysis of publications based upon Office of Educational Research and Improvement supported research has been revised to include only articles and citations printed in a pre-selected group of periodicals and journals which are known to employ rigorous peer review processes. This better represents measurement of progress toward a high standard of quality as opposed to measurement of the volume of publications. Similarly, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement will begin to employ panels of experts to assess its work products as a central means for judging the quality and effectiveness of its investments. Such data will provide important feedback to guide the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's future improvement efforts, while also giving both the agency and the Congress meaningful indicators for measuring progress over time.

REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES

Goal: To promote knowledge-based educational improvement to help all students meet high standards through development, applied research, dissemination, and technical assistance conducted with local, state, and intermediate agencies.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Program objectives relate to the Department's strategic Objectives 4.2 (partners receive needed support) and 4.3 (research knowledge base is available to support education reform and equity) in providing a range of services and up-to-date knowledge to support comprehensive school reform efforts.

FY 2000—$65,000,000

FY 2001—Funds for the Regional Educational Laboratories are being requested under the Research, Development, and Dissemination Program. The total FY 2001 request is $198,567,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: DEVELOP, ADAPT, AND ASSESS COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION REFORM STRATEGIES IN SCHOOLS, DISTRICTS, AND STATES.

Indicator 1.1 Number of development sites: An increasing number of local or state sites will be engaged in collaborative development and demonstration of comprehensive reform-related efforts.

Targets and Performance Data

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets
	Sites	Students	Teachers	Administrators	Parents	
1997:	494	83,147	5,899	512	14,437	
1998:	615	93,788	6,950	749	16,062	
1999:	**365**	**538,865**	**37,550**	**5,169**	**10,148**	**Continuing increase**
2000:						Continuing increase
2001:						Continuing increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: 1999 shows an increase in number of sites. 1998 data show an increase in the number of development sites while 1999 data show an overall increase.

Explanation: The number of sites where Laboratories and schools/districts/states are involved in comprehensive reform-related efforts increased from 494 in 1997 to 615 in 1998, and then decreased to 365 in 1999. The 1999 total reflects an overall decrease resulting from the deletions and additions of sites from 1997 to 1999 (i.e., older sites no longer were involved in development efforts). Significant increases in the numbers of students, teachers, and administrators reflect the Laboratories' new initiatives at the larger district and state level.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 1999.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by Laboratories. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: ED relies on Laboratory records for these data.

Indicator 1.2 Student achievement: After 3 years of on-site development, sites will show increases in student achievement.

Targets and Performance Data

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999:	**No data available**	**No previous target set**
2000:		Increased achievement trend from 1997 to 2000
2001:		Continued increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge.

Explanation: Student achievement data will be available in November 2000, before Laboratory contracts end in December 2000.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: State or local assessments, 2000.
Frequency: Annually, after 3 years of onsite development.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Laboratories will supply data. No formal verification procedure to be applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Based on Laboratory reporting. In the future, ED may follow up with surveys to sites.

774

OBJECTIVE 2: PROVIDE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES AND DEVELOP NETWORKS AND PARTNERSHIPS IN SUPPORT OF STATE AND LOCAL REFORM.

Indicator 2.1 Customer Receipt of Products and Services: The circulation of products, receipt of services, and receipt of electronic material will increase annually from baseline levels.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**	**Status:** 1999 data show significant increases in the numbers of clients receiving products and in Web site hits, and a decrease in the number of clients receiving face-to-face services. **Explanation:** More clients have access to the Internet and are being reached electronically in greater numbers.	**Source:** Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by Laboratories. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** ED relies on Laboratory records for these data.
	Products to # of Clients	**Face-to-Face Services**	**Web Site Hits**			
1997:	419,927	148,966	11,834,588			
1998:	988,055	178,555	19,305,052			
1999:	**2,132,530**	**125,517**	**30,379,269**	**Continuing increase**		
2000:				Continuing increase		
2001:				Continuing increase		

Indicator 2.2 Quality of products and services: At least 90 percent of clients sampled will report laboratory products and services to be of high quality.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of clients rating products and services to be of excellent or good quality			**Status:** 1999 data are not yet available, but it is likely that the target will be met. **Explanation:** 1998 performance information and 1999 external evaluation indicate that Laboratory products and services are of consistent high quality.	**Source:** Client surveys, 1999; ED external evaluation, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data as well as by external evaluation. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	90.0%			
1998:	90.1%			
1999:	**No data available**	**90%**		
2000:		90%		
2001:		90%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- In order to focus Regional Educational Laboratory work on implementing comprehensive school reforms and moving these reforms to scale, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) establishes contract priorities for Laboratory work to focus on these initiatives.
- Laboratories develop and adapt an array of research-based products and services for use by schools, districts, and states.
- Laboratories provide a range of services from heightening awareness to more in-depth and sustained collaborative activities.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- In order to implement effective, research-based comprehensive reform strategies, Regional Educational Laboratories will increase collaboration with state and local agencies.
- Laboratories will develop and adapt tested models, policies, and strategies for comprehensive school reform.
- In order to address the field needs for effective school reform practices, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement will encourage and support Laboratories to identify and disseminate exemplary and promising comprehensive school-reform practices.
- In order to leverage resources and move education reform efforts to scale, Laboratories will create and expand regional and nationwide networks and alliances with practitioners, policymakers, and other service providers.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- In order to promote collaboration on Department initiatives—such as work on the Reading Excellence Act (REA), professional development, and integration of technology into classroom practice—the Office of Educational Research and Improvement brokers Regional Educational Laboratory services to other Department offices, such as the Office of the Secretary, the Reading Initiative and the Professional Development Initiative, and the Planning and Evaluation Service.
- In order to help coordinate the work of various Department offices with the needs of practitioners in the field, the Laboratories are integrally involved in planning and implementing the Department's Improving America's Schools meetings around the country.
- The Office of Educational Research and Improvement assists in identifying opportunities for Laboratories to collaborate with other Federal agencies, such as the Department of Defense (DoD) Education Activity to plan and provide technology training for DoD teachers and administrators; with the Department of Health and Human Services to develop early childhood initiatives; and with the Department of Labor to develop school-to-work assessment instruments.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- In order to address the challenge of engaging the lowest performing schools in comprehensive school reform, the Regional Educational Laboratories initiate intensive work with schools on local "academic watch lists" and assist schools that are implementing comprehensive reforms through Obey-Porter legislation.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Objectives 1 and 2 and their Indicators were reworded for clarification.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 2.1, and 2.5, as well as Objective 3 and its indicators, were dropped because the Department requested that the plan be shortened.

New—None.

DISSEMINATION

Goal: To provide educators, policymakers, researchers, parents, and the public with awareness of, access to, and assistance in adapting and adopting useful products and services designed to improve American education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Goal 4 (results, service quality, and customer satisfaction) and specifically Objective 4.1 (dissemination of high-quality information and products).

FY 2000—$18,785,000

FY 2001—Funds for the Dissemination Program are being requested under the Research, Development, and Dissemination Program. The total FY 2001 request is $198,567,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: IDENTIFY, DEVELOP, PRODUCE, AND DISTRIBUTE HIGH-QUALITY PRODUCTS THAT MEET CUSTOMER NEEDS AND ADDRESS DEPARTMENT PRIORITIES.

Indicator 1.1: The number of clients who access Department products and services through various components of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) will increase each year.

Targets & Performance Data

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
Internet: Visits		
1998:	12,506,281	
1999:	**27,785,053 (*122%)**	**10% increase**
2000:		10% increase
2001:		10% increase
Internet: Emails		
1998:	7,636	
1999:	**12,462 (*63%)**	**10% increase**
2000:		10% increase
2001:		10% increase
National Library of Education (NLE) 800#: Calls		
1998:	45,785	
1999:	**19,582 (**57%)**	**10% increase**
2000:		10% increase
2001:		10% increase
EDPubs: Calls		
1998:	30,271	
1999:	**156, 328 (*416%)**	**10% increase**
2000:		10% increase
2001:		10% increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded for Internet visits and e-mails, EDPubs, and Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC). Trend away from target for National Library of Education (NLE) and OERI products.

Explanation:
Internet: 1999 data on visits are for those from January to October.

NLE 800#: Number of calls decreased in 1999 because calls for publications went to EDPubs instead. The expectation is that the number of calls will decrease and the number of emails will increase as more customers gain access to the Internet.

EDPubs: According to the first government-wide customer satisfaction survey, EDPubs scored an 80 out of a possible 100, surpassing the national score by 11 percent. For delivering excellent customer service, EDPubs won a Reinvention Award, and, in August 1999, received Vice President Gore's prestigious Hammer Award.

Consumer Information Center (CIC)
Distribution: Sales of ED publications dropped in 1999; this demand was replaced by Web site hits.

Sources and Data Quality

Source:
Internet: Internet server reports;
NLE 800#: System reports;
EDPubs: Contractor report;
CIC: Quarterly reports;
GPO: Quarterly ROPS report;
ERIC: Contractor report.
Frequency: Annually.
Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by NLE and contractors. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitation of Data and Planned Improvements: Future data collection will need to be planned to disaggregate data by customer type. NLE and OERI customer satisfaction forms do ask people their "customer type," but the insufficient numbers of responses to this question do not allow for appropriate data analysis.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Targets & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
EDPubs: E-mails			GPO Sales: Decreased Deputy Education Quality in 1999 because OERI recommended fewer titles to GPO. At the same time, distribution through EDPubs and the Web increased. ERIC: Data are from the January 1999 and January 2000 annual reports.	
1998:	4,292			
1999:	**160,782 (*3,646%)**	**10% increase**		
2000:		10% increase		
2001:		10% increase		
OERI Products: Consumer Information Center (CIC)				
1998:	111,787			
1999:	**67,748 (**39%)**	**10% increase**		
2000:		10% increase		
2001:		10% increase		
OERI Products: Government Printing Office Sales				
1998:	31, 596			
1999:	**23,177 (**27%)**	**10% increase**		
2000:		10% increase		
2001:		10% increase		
Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC): Calls				
1998:	50,729			
1999:	**55,694 (*10%)**	**10% increase**		
2000:		10% increase		
2001:		10% increase		
Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC): E-mails				
1998:	89,036			
1999:	**116,834 (*31%)**	**10% increase**		
2000:		10% increase		
2001:		10% increase		
* increase ** decrease				

OBJECTIVE 2: ENSURE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION WITH THE HIGH QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF OERI'S RESEARCH AND STATISTICAL PRODUCTS.

Indicator 2.1: At least 90 percent of teachers; administrators; Federal, state, and local policymakers; researchers; parents; and the public sampled will report that the Department products accessed through OERI are of high quality.

Targets & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey			**Status:** Target met. **Explanation:** From a list of 20,000 individuals, NCES questionnaires were sent to 2,984. Of that total, 2,465 responded, for a response rate of 83 percent. From 340 callers, EDPubs selected every tenth caller (34 individuals) to receive a telephone survey on the quality of OERI products.	**Source:** NCES 1997 Customer Satisfaction Survey. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Source:** EDPubs Customer Survey. *Frequency:* Annually. Next Update: 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**90% reported "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with quality of Reports**	**90%**		
2000:		90%		
2001:		90%		

Targets & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
EDPub Survey			OERI's new Publication Survey was implemented in September 1999. Data were collected in September-October 1999.	**Source:** Survey included in all OERI publications. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by MIS. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Samples will be increased in 2000.
1999:	**Over 90% of respondents rated OERI products to be of "high quality".**	**90%**		
2000:		90%		
2001:		90%		
OERI's Publication Survey				
1999:	**Over 90% of respondents were "very satisfied" with OERI products.**	**90%**		
2000:		90%		
2001:		90%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Obtain customer feedback to ensure that products and services reflect customer needs and priorities.
- Increase the numbers of users who access products and services through expanded services, such as Internet and EDPubs.
- Provide timely and specific capacity building and technical assistance activities conducted by NCES University, NLE, and Media and Information Services.
- Obtain customer feedback on the ways to improve the usefulness of technical assistance activities.
- Evaluate customer satisfaction through customer surveys.
- Continue *Research Bytes*, a listserv for researchers and ED senior staff that is designed to share the latest research findings from Labs, Centers, and FIS, and which can be expanded to educators, policymakers, and the general public.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To increase the awareness of and access to Department products and services, redesign the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's (OERI's) Web site. Include a mechanism for customer feedback.
- To increase the Department's awareness of how its sponsored research is used, expand the distribution of Research Reaching People, an internal electronic newsletter designed primarily for the Department's Office of Public Affairs and Office of International and Interagency Affairs (OIIA), that contains vignettes on ways the general public is using OERI research.
- To increase sample sizes for customer feedback, evaluate customer satisfaction through focus groups as well as surveys.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- In order to promote compliance with the Presidential Directive to have a single entry point for Federal government information, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) provides leadership for the Federal Resources for Educational Excellence (FREE) Committee that includes approximately 35 Federal agencies.
- OERI works with the Office of International and Intergovernmental Affairs (OIIA) to lead the Department's crosscutting customer service initiative.
- Components of OERI's dissemination service collaborate with several other Federal agencies, including the Government Printing Office (GPO), Center for Consumer Information (CIC), National Education Association, Health and Human Services (HHS), Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of the Census, and others.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Increasing costs associated with increasing sample sizes to more accurately measure customer satisfaction.
- Transitioning from a predominantly print-based culture to a computer-based one.
- Improving quality and expanding access will increase the demand for OERI products and high-quality services: will we be able to meet this increased demand?

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years ago)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Wording of Indicators 1.1 and 2.1 has been revised to clarify meaning.

Dropped

- Indicator 3.1, on the Department's Expert Panels' identification and dissemination of exemplary and promising program descriptions, was dropped because the Department's role with Expert Panels became controversial. Also, we were asked to remove nonstrategic indicators.

New—None.

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION

Goal: To contribute to the achievement of the National Education Goals by supporting nationally significant and innovative projects for improving K-12 education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) supports all of the objectives under Goal 1 of the Strategic Plan by funding projects that help all students reach challenging academic standards and become prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

FY 2000—$243,864,000

FY 2001—$137,150,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: SUPPORT THE DEPARTMENT'S STRATEGIC PRIORITIES IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION THROUGH NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS OF HIGH QUALITY.

Indicator 1.1 Nationally significant projects and supportive of strategic priorities: Ninety percent of all FIE-funded projects will support the Department's strategic priorities in elementary and secondary education, and 90 percent of the peer-reviewed projects will receive at least an 80 percent rating for national significance.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Alignment With Strategic Priorities		**National Significance**		**Status:** Target met for alignment with strategic priorities; negative trend away from the target for national significance.	**Source:** Review by Assistant Secretary's Office, 1999; peer-reviewer ratings of applications, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**100%**	**100%**	**72%**	**90%**	**Explanation:** 100 percent of all FIE projects in both FY 1998 and FY 1999 supported the Department's priorities. Earmarked projects were not included in the analysis of national significance because their applications are not peer reviewed. Of peer-reviewed projects, 83 percent of FY 1998 projects scored at least 80 percent for national significance, while only 72 percent of FY 1999 projects scored at least 80 percent for national significance. The average rating for national significance decreased from 88 percent in FY 1998 to 84 percent in FY 1999. 100 percent of the competitively awarded character education projects scored 80 percent or above for national significance, but only 60 percent of report directives and 75 percent of unsolicited projects met the target. The average score for national significance for character education projects was 92 percent, for report directives 78 percent, and for unsolicited projects 89 percent. Non-competitive projects are often locally focused and their significance cannot easily be assessed from their original applications. However, overall, the projects meet high standards and are expected to produce nationally significant results by the end of the project period.	**Validation Procedure:** Data collected from peer-review instruments. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Available data assess only the potential of projects based on their original applications for funding. The program office is developing plans to conduct external review of selected key projects at the end of their grant period and will drop this indicator when improved data on project outcomes and impacts become available in 2001.
2000:		100%		90%		
2001:		100%		90%		
2002:	Indicator to be replaced with improved data on project outcomes and impacts.					

Indicator 1.2 High quality: Ninety percent of peer-reviewed projects will receive at least an 80 percent rating for quality of project design.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Criteria: project design			**Status:** Negative trend away from the target.	**Source:** Peer-reviewer ratings of applications, 1999.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually.
1999:	**48%**	**90%**	**Explanation:** Earmarked projects were not included in the analysis of project design because their applications are not peer reviewed. Of peer-reviewed projects, 66 percent of FY 1998 projects scored at least 80 percent for project design while only 46 percent of FY 1999 projects achieved the target. The average rating for project design also decreased from 82 percent in FY 1998 to 79 percent in FY 1999. Competitively selected projects scored noticeably higher than non-competitively awarded projects. Eighty-nine percent of the character education projects scored 80 percent or above for project design, but only 36 percent of report directives and 38 percent of the unsolicited projects met the target. However, the average score for project design for character education projects was 92 percent, for report directives 75 percent, and for unsolicited projects 77 percent. Although noncompetitive applicants appear to have little incentive to strive for high standards in writing applications, more data are needed to draw firm conclusions about the quality of the design of FIE projects.	*Next Update:* 2000.
2000:		90%		**Validation Procedure:** Data collected from peer-review instruments.
2001:		90%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Available data assess only the potential of projects based on their original applications for funding. The program office is developing plans to conduct external review of selected key projects at the end of their grant period and will drop this indicator when improved data on project outcomes and impact become available in 2001.
2002:	Indicator to be replaced with improved data on project outcomes and impacts.			

Indicator 1.3 Progress: Eighty percent of projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies or yielded results that can contribute to improving education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge at this time.	**Source:** Final reports, which will be externally reviewed.
1999:	**Not available***	**N/A**		*Frequency:* Annually.
2000:	Baseline to be set	80%	**Explanation:** The indicator was modified to ensure that information is available on the extent to which projects are likely to contribute to improving education. Data will be reported by types of activities. The modification ensures a more rigorous review of project outcomes. The prior indicator was that "90 percent of all FIE projects will show evidence in their continuation and final reports of progress on measures of their project-specific indicators."	*Next Update:* 2000.
2001:		80%		**Validation Procedure:** No data to validate.
2002:		80%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** N/A.

*In 1999, 99 percent of projects made substantial progress on their project-specific indicators, a less rigorous measure. Information on the extent to which projects have successfully implemented strategies or yielded results that can contribute to improving education will be obtained for a sample of projects in 2000.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To assist the projects in using data to improve practice, the program will closely monitor the formative evaluations of funded projects and improve the documentation of outcomes and impacts.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To assess the impact of projects, the program will develop and implement a strategy for conducting external review of selected key projects.
- To provide technical assistance on improving project evaluation, to facilitate networking and collaboration among similar projects, and to capture lessons learned by projects, the program will convene all Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) grantees annually.
- To leverage the results of Fund for the Improvement of Education projects and contribute to the body of knowledge about educational reform, the program will develop and disseminate a summary of the findings from this annual meeting and will work with ED-Pubs to produce and disseminate significant lessons learned from Fund for the Improvement of Education projects.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- To study the effects of testing and assessment on policies for educational and human resources, Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) collaborates with the Departments of Defense and Labor, with the National Research Center's Board on Testing and Assessment, and with various offices within the Department.
- To increase knowledge about the effects of early growth and development on later educational success, Fund for the Improvement of Education collaborates on early childhood research with the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), and the National Science Foundation (NSF).
- To improve mathematics and science teaching and learning, Fund for the Improvement of Education collaborates with the National Academy of Sciences on studies to examine teacher-training practices and to compare advanced placement U.S. students with those from other nations in their performance in mathematics and science.
- To improve literacy, Fund for the Improvement of Education is working with the National Center for Learning Disabilities to study the role of reading ability in successful lifelong learning.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- It is difficult to build coherence across such a diverse set of activities as those supported by FIE.
- It is difficult to develop standard measures to assess the quality and impact of such diverse activities.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1, High Quality, was divided into three more-specific indicators in the FY 2000 plan.
- A new objective and two indicators for dissemination were added to the FY 2000 plan.

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1, National tests, and 3.1, Support effective schools and teachers, were dropped from the FY 2000 plan because they were not focused on outcomes.

From FY 2000Annual Plan (last year)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.3, Progress, has been adjusted to ensure that data are available on how well the projects address key authorized purposes of the FIE funds. The revised indicator measures the extent to which completed projects are of high quality and address nationally significant issues, and also the extent to which the projects improve the quality of education (for example, by improving the quality of instruction, improving the curriculum, or improving the likelihood that students will meet challenging state student performance standards). Data will be reported by types of activities.

Dropped

- Objective 2 and Indicators 2.1 and 2.2 for dissemination have been dropped from the FY 2001 performance plan as an objective and indicators because they have been incorporated into strategies. They will be tracked for program management purposes.

New—None.

JAVITS GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS EDUCATION

Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students through research, demonstration projects, personnel training, and other activities of national significance.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Javits program supports research and evaluation that will improve the knowledge based on education reform (Objective 4.3). The program has a particular focus on special populations (Objective 2.4) through its development of models for developing the talents of disadvantaged, Limited English Proficient (LEP), or disabled students.

FY 2000—$6,500,000

FY 2001—$7,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: CONDUCT RESEARCH AND EVALUATION ON GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION THAT WILL IMPROVE THE IDENTIFICATION AND TEACHING OF GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS.

Indicator 1.1 Utility: At least 80 percent of recipients will report that the research products and evaluation results from the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented help them to improve the identification and teaching of gifted and talented students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
In 1999, surveys of participants in Center workshops found:			**Status:** Unable to judge at this time.	**Source:** Customer surveys, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000.
Improved understanding of gifted and talented education			**Explanation:** Because the customer survey did not have specific questions on improving the identification and teaching of gifted and talented students, we are unable to judge, but progress is likely. There are positive data on related topics, such as improving the understanding of gifted and talented education, and we estimate that data on this indicator will also be positive. The national evaluation report in 2000 is expected to include specific data on the value of the Center in improving the identification and teaching of gifted and talented students.	**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by Center.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Target**		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Current measures do not exactly match this indicator, but customer surveys will be aligned with the performance plan in the future. Data will be corroborated by external evaluation in 2001.
1999:	**89%**	**No target set**		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		
Usefulness of information				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Target**		
1999:	**76%**	**No target set**		
2000:		80%		
2001:		80%		
2002:		80%		

OBJECTIVE 2: DEVELOP MODELS FOR DEVELOPING THE TALENTS OF STUDENTS WHO ARE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, ARE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP), AND/OR HAVE DISABILITIES.

Indicator 2.1 Model effectiveness: At least 80 percent of Javits-supported projects will develop and implement model programs that increase the diversity of students identified as gifted and talented in their service region by at least 15 percent by the end of the project period, and that meet the needs of identified gifted students.

Targets and Performance Data								Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**# of projects ended in FY**	**Percentage of projects increasing in diversity by at least 15 percent**		**Percentage if teachers reporting use of differentiation strategies**		**Percentage of teachers reporting increased student independence**		**Status:** Unable to judge, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** Preliminary baseline data from the national evaluation: three projects appear to have increased diversity by 11 to 14 percent; two projects appear to have had less positive increases; two projects appear to have trended away from the target by 1 to 14 percent; two projects are near the target for meeting the needs of gifted students.	**Source:** National evaluation, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Internal review procedures of National Research Center (by Statute, the national evaluators). **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Record keeping by projects is inconsistent, making data collection and analysis difficult. The National Research Center will conduct annual workshops with the projects to improve evaluation.
		Actual	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Target**		
1999:	7	0%	No target set	78%	No target set	79%	No target set		
2000:			80%		80%		80%		
2001:			80%		80%		80%		
2002:			80%		80%		80%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- The Research Center will work with national, state, and local associations and agencies, through the National Research Center Advisory Council, to (1) develop a useful, national research and development agenda for the Center, (2) support dissemination of high-quality products from the Center, and (3) establish competitive priorities for new grants that implement effective research-based practices that increase student diversity in gifted and talented educational programs and improve the quality of programs.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To improve alignment with the program's performance plan and improve the reliability and validity of data, the Javits grantees will attend an annual workshop, conducted by the National Research Center, on evaluation.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The Javits Program collaborates with the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association for Gifted Children on an ongoing basis to discuss ways of improving educational opportunities for gifted and talented children. Additionally, program staff is working with the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services to focus on minority representation in gifted and talented programs. The program has also collaborated with the Office of Indian Education (OIE) and the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) to produce reports on the status of gifted education with those special populations.
- The Research Center is a collaboration of five leading universities which also receives funding from other Federal agencies for gifted and talented education.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- It is difficult for the Research Center to maintain a consistent research agenda in an environment of shifting priorities and in the complex, ever-changing settings of their school research sites.
- All Javits project sites are in empowerment zones that have a host of educational, resource, and cultural barriers to innovation and success. They are often faced with entrenched notions that make it difficult for them both to identify gifted and talented students from among traditionally underserved populations and to provide services outside the school norms.
- The first objective of Javits projects is to increase the diversity of students identified as gifted and talented and to provide them with appropriate services. Projects are fully engaged in achieving this objective and have little time or resources to focus on integrating gifted and talented strategies into the larger school context.
- It is difficult for the three-year Javits projects to change or improve the total school environment with the gifted and talented programs developed during the project period.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 were consolidated into a single FY 2000 Indicator (1.1) emphasizing the impact of Center products and services.
- Indicator 2.1 was adjusted to establish a target for increased diversity in FY 2000.
- Indicator 3.1 was adjusted to strengthen its focus on impact in FY 2000.

Dropped

- Indicators 2.2 and 2.3 were dropped to reduce the overall size of the plan.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicators 1.1 and 2.1 were adjusted to align better with their respective objectives.
- Impact on total school improvement was removed from Objective 1 because the Center has been unable to identify a sufficient number of gifted and talented programs engaged in total school improvement to conduct a viable research study.

Dropped

- Indicator 3.1, Leadership, was dropped because of its overlap with Indicator 1.1.

New—None.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT (NWP)

Goal: To improve the quality of student writing and learning, and the teaching of writing as a learning process in the nation's classrooms.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The National Writing Project supports objective 1.1 (challenging standards and assessments) in its emphasis on helping students improve their writing and helping them meet performance standards set by states. It also supports objective 1.4 (qualified teachers) by establishing teacher training programs to improve teachers' writing skills. It supports objective 1.5 (family involvement) through its emphasis on linking NWP with the Family Involvement Partnership, the America Reads Challenge, and in compacts for reading initiatives. It also supports objective 2.2 (early reading) by emphasizing linkages to reading and writing. It supports Objective 4.3 (education research to support education reform and equity) by linking research on effective teaching of writing to classroom practice.

FY 2000—$9,000,000

FY 2001—$10,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: SUPPORT AND PROMOTE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO IMPROVE THE WRITING SKILLS OF TEACHERS AND STUDENTS.

Indicator 1.1 Teacher satisfaction: Each year, National Writing Project teacher participants and teacher leaders will rate the program as good or excellent and will affirm that it has had a positive impact on their teaching practice.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Rating				**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Sources:** NWP Site Survey prepared by Inverness Research Associates.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		*Frequency:* Annually
1999:	**95%***	**91%#**	**75%**	**Explanation:** Participant rating: Data gathered at summer 1999 institutes showed 95% of new teacher participants rated the National Writing Project program as good or excellent. The 1999 Inverness data collection found a higher percentage of good or excellent ratings than projected.	*Next Update:* Fall, 2000
2000:			75%		
2001:			80%		U.S. Department of Education Voices in the Field
2002:			80%		*Frequency:* One-time
Impact					*Next Update:* None
1999:	**N/A% ***	**90% #**	**75%**	Voices in the Field found that 91% of teacher leaders were "very satisfied" with NWP programs.	**Validation Procedure:** Inverness data collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data developed; Inverness uses NSF model for collection/verification.
2000:			75%		
2001:			75%	--Impact on Practice: A Voices in the Field survey showed 90% of teacher leaders participating in the National Writing Project annual meeting reported that their teaching practice changed "a great deal" due to National Writing Project professional development participation, 7% reported their practice changed "somewhat."	Voices in the Field data collected at annual meeting. No formal verification procedure applied.
2002:			75%		
* Inverness data # Voices in the Field					**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Voices in the Field supplements 1999 Inverness data, which will be realigned for 2000 to measure impact on practice.

Indicator 1.2 Improved student writing skills: Students taught by NWP teachers will show improved student writing skills.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Writing scores			**Status:** No 1999 target previously set. Unable to judge.	**Source:** Academy for Educational Development. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update*: Fall, 2000
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Target to be established	**Explanation:** Assessment in design phase during 1999, first available data in Fall 2000. Data collected at 25 sites in 4 states. At sample sites, at least 40% of student population eligible for free or reduced lunch. Evaluation model for sampling of 25 third- and fourth-grade classrooms in Mississippi, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and California developed in 1999. First year report to be issued in early October 2000. Study documents a cohort of students annually using a pre-post assessment design. Sample size will be adjusted to show national results.	**Validation Procedure:** Data to be supplied by the Academy for Educational Development. Validation procedure to be determined.
2001:		Target to be established		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Current data not available. Assessment to be aligned with other standardized assessments.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies continued from 1999

- To facilitate intra-agency collaboration, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) provides bridge services between the NWP and other student literacy programs, including America Reads Challenge and the Family Involvement Partnership. The National Writing Project has earmarked resources toward providing coordination and technical assistance to NWP sites and the other literacy programs. Several National Writing Project sites have designed and conducted community events under the America Reads Challenge to promote reading and writing.
- To monitor and enhance the quality of teacher professional development, the National Writing Project conducts annual peer review of each site and offers special services to sites, as needed, to ensure consistent high quality through ongoing review, evaluation, and technical assistance.
- To enhance customer service and strengthen research to practice, ED to provide a link between NWP and ED customers interested in teaching methods of writing, through linking Web sites, developing a teacher discussion group on-line, and collaborating on a research and practice-based book for writing teachers.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To enhance teacher professional development, the National Writing Project will add new sites each year so that eventually there will be an NWP site within reach of every teacher in the country.
- To share best practices, the National Writing Project will help more sites work directly with other sites in its network through cross-site networks and special initiatives.
- To enhance its teachers-teaching-teachers model, the National Writing Project will strengthen its work on developing teacher leadership at local sites.
- To reach more teachers, the National Writing Project will design and develop technology tools to support sites' outreach to teachers.
- To determine the best measurement of student assessment, data being collected for the National Writing Project classroom study (Indicator 1.2) will be reviewed in relation to the data on instructional practices provided in the NAEP 1998 Writing Report Card, such as teachers talking with students about their writing; teachers saving student work in a folder or portfolio; students being asked to write more than one draft of a paper; and students being asked to plan their writing, as well as available state data.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Collaboration with the National Endowment for the Humanities in the Family History/Schools for the New Millennium initiative.
- Linking of the National Writing Project Web site to the National Endowment for the Humanities Web site and dissemination of Family History/Schools for the New Millennium materials to 165 local writing project sites.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Local sites are experiencing a large number of teacher retirements in their service areas. There are increasing professional development demands on writing project sites to work with new teachers, and it is a challenge in some parts of the country to meet these increased demands.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From two year old Annual Plan (FY 1999)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1, (teacher participation), was changed to measure teacher satisfaction, and became an outcome, rather than an output measure
- Indicator 2.2, (development of alternative methods of student evaluations by teachers) was incorporated into Indicator 1.2, (improved student writing).

Dropped

- Indicator 2.1, (teachers teaching their colleagues), was dropped. It was an output measure and has been kept as an internal measure.
- Indicator 2.3, (sites adapted for special needs of students), was dropped. It was an output measure and it continues to be a priority of the National Writing Project.

From last year's Annual Plan (FY 2000)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1, (teacher satisfaction), now specifies change of teaching practice in addition to satisfaction, and targets new teacher participants and teacher leaders for measurement. The 75% target is now listed under Performance Target.
- Indicator 1.3, (improved student writing skills), is renumbered 1.2 and is changed to remove the sentence, "NWP teachers will develop methods to assess student writing."

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2, (project site performance), is dropped. It is not an outcome indicator and will continue to be kept as an internal measurement.

New—None.

CIVIC EDUCATION

Goal: To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth National Education Goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The "We the People" program for civic education supports objective 1.1 (states develop challenging standards) of the Strategic Plan. The program funds the Center for Civic Education to teach students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States and foster civic competence and responsibility.

FY 2000—$9,850,0000

FY 2001—$9,850,0000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY CIVIC EDUCATION CURRICULA TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS THROUGH THE "WE THE PEOPLE: THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION" PROGRAM.

Indicator 1.1 Student participation in the "We the People" program: The total number of adoptions of "We the People" curriculum will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The total number of adoptions by states and large school districts of the We the People... curriculum has reached 19 as of the end of the summer of 1999.			**Status:** Target met. **Explanation:** The **We the People...** program's staff members have invested more time in assisting states and school districts in the formal curriculum adoption process.	**Source:** Annual grantee project report and annual grant application, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* 2000 **Validation Procedure:** Actual count of adoptions. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996:	1			
1997:	4			
1998:	9			
1999:	**19**	**No target set**		
2000:		20		
2001:		21		
2002:		22		

Indicator 1.2 Teacher institutes: The number of teachers who attend the summer "We the People" professional development institutes will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of teachers participating in professional development institutes in the summer of 1999 was 317.			**Status:** Target exceeded. **Explanation:** The "**We the People...,**" program staff members were able to conduct institutes in each of five regions of the United States.	**Source:** Annual grantee project report and annual grant application, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* 2000 **Validation Procedure:** Actual count of teacher participants. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	183			
1999:	**317**	**200**		
2000:		318		
2001:		320		
2002:		320		

806

807

OBJECTIVE 2: FOSTER STUDENTS' INTEREST AND ABILITY TO PARTICIPATE COMPETENTLY AND RESPONSIBLY IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS.

Indicator 2.1 Simulated congressional hearings: At least 80% of students participating in the We the People... national finals competition will outperform non-participating students on national assessments of their knowledge of and support for democratic institutions and processes.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	**Status:** Target exceeded.	**Source:** Annual random sample of participants in the **We the People...** national finals.
1999:	**89%**	**80%**		*Frequency*: Annually
2000		80%	**Explanation:** Survey items were taken from the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress Civics assessment, the 1998 University of Michigan's "Monitoring the Future" survey, and the 1998 UCLA American freshman survey. An item-by-item comparison was conducted, and at least 89 percent of the participants in the **We the People...** finals outperformed the average of non-participating students in knowledge of and support for democratic institutions and processes by statistically significant margins on every item of a survey instrument based on previous nationally administered surveys.	*Next Update*: 2000
2001		80%		**Validation Procedure:** The National Assessment of Educational Progress, Michigan, and UCLA survey results have been validated by National Center for Education Statistics and other nationally recognized research institutions. The Center for Civic Education utilizes its own internal review procedures in conducting its survey of the participants in the national finals and in analyzing the results.
2002		80%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported. The Center for Civic Education would like to utilize an external data collection agency to conduct its surveys and prepare independent reports, but additional funding would be required to support external evaluation.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies continued from 1999

- Participate in planning and administering the annual national hearings and student competition for "We the People" in Washington, D.C.
- Increase awareness of civic education through Department of Education public information vehicles.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- To increase awareness of the value of civic education among educators, disseminate information about the "We the People" program through program coordinators and publications and conduct targeted outreach to tribally controlled schools and teachers.
- To increase student knowledge of civics, work collaboratively with the Department of Justice to support the development or revision of curricular materials on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Facilitate collaboration between the Center for Civic Education and Center for Educational Technologies in the development of DVD and Internet access to these materials.
- To strengthen accountability, encourage the Center for Civic Education to update its survey with the most recent publicly released items from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, Michigan, and UCLA civics assessments.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The **We the People...** program activities have been used as models for civic education in many other countries, especially emerging democracies, through **Civitas: An International Civic Education Exchange**. The **Civitas** program is funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The materials have been translated by educators in at least 16 countries.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Insufficient preservice teacher preparation in civics and government makes the task of teaching about the American constitutional system more difficult.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From two years old Annual plan (FY 1999)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From last year's Annual Plan (FY 2000)

Adjusted

- The performance data for last year's Indicator 1.1 was modified to clarify that the cumulative total number of adoptions is being measured. The indicator itself did not change. Last year's Indicator read: "At least 80% of sampled students in participating classes will have increased their knowledge of and support for democratic institutions and processes."
- Indicator 2.1 was modified to align the indicator with Objective 2 and to clarify the comparison actually being made by the Center for Civic Education.
- Note that the "Source" for Objective 2.1 has been corrected to "annual random sample of participating classes at the **We the People…** national finals."

Dropped—None.

New—None.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Goal: To provide for an international education exchange program and the study of international programs and delivery systems.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This program supports Objective 1.1 (Develop challenging standards for all students in core subjects).

FY 2000—$7,000,000

FY 2001—$8,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: ASSIST ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES IN ADAPTING AND IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE CURRICULA AND TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN CIVICS AND GOVERNMENT EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC EDUCATION DEVELOPED IN THE UNITED STATES.

Indicator 1.1 Student knowledge and skills: Participating students will demonstrate increased knowledge, skills, and traits of character in their understanding of civics, and democratic and economic principles.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Economic Education Students			**Status:** Economic Education: Progress toward target is likely.	**Source:** Economic Education: Evaluation of students' knowledge, Education Development Center (EDC) Research Study 1998. *Frequency:* Triennially *Next Update:* 2001
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	In the five-country study (Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Ukraine), 65 percent of the students (N=1,938) of teachers participating in the program showed an improvement in the knowledge of economics content from pre-test to post-test. In Kyrgyzstan, one year after teacher participation in the program, 68 percent of students (N=552) showed an improvement in knowledge of economics content. In the same country, two years after teacher participation in the program, 74 percent of students (N=308) showed an improvement in their knowledge of economics content.	**No target set**	**Explanation:** In addition to solid quantitative data on knowledge gains, external evaluations and awardees have documented gains in use of active learning teaching methods and educators' and students' attitudes toward market economics. Educators in Training of Trainers program increased economic knowledge by 29 percent. Teachers in introductory teacher workshops increased their economic knowledge by 11 percent.	Evaluation of trainers and teachers, EDC Report 1998-99; *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* 2000 **Validation Procedure:** An external evaluation is conducted annually by the EDC. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Frequency of data collection is limited by the prohibitive cost of conducting comprehensive student assessments in each country involved in the International Education Program.
2000:		65%		
2001:		65%		
2002:		65%		

812

813

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Civics and Government Education			**Status:** Civics and Government Education: Progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** As programs with proven effectiveness among students in the U.S. are adapted and implemented internationally, evaluations measuring increases in student civic knowledge, skills and traits of character are expected to yield positive results.	**Source:** An Evaluation of "Citizen in a Democracy" conducted by Charles D. Dziuban, Jeffrey W. Cornett, and Patsy D. Moskal of the University of Central Florida in cooperation with the Florida Law Related Education Association, Inc., and the Civitas Association of Hungary, July 31, 1999. *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* 2000 **Validation Procedure:** An external evaluation of the civic education program is conducted annually. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data is based on survey reporting by international participants and is limited by the prohibitive cost of conducting comprehensive student assessments in each country involved in the International Education Program.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Target Performance**		
1999:	A survey of students from Hungary revealed that as a result of participating in the program, 96% of students felt they had improved their skills as effective citizens, 95% had increased their understanding of their civic rights and responsibilities and 77% reported a greater commitment to democracy.	**No target set**		
2000:		95%		
2001:		95%		
2002:		95%		

OBJECTIVE 2: CREATE AND IMPLEMENT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR UNITED STATES STUDENTS WHICH DRAW UPON THE EXPERIENCES OF EMERGING CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACIES.

Indicator 2.1 Implementation of civic and economic education programs in the U.S.: An increasing number of students and teachers in the U.S. will participate in programs based on the experiences of emerging constitutional democracies.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
A minimum of the following U.S. students and teachers participated in civic and economic education programs based on the experiences of emerging democracies					**Status:** Progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** Each year, the number of U.S. students and teachers involved in implementing civic and economic education curriculum materials has increased due to expanded distribution of curriculum materials.	**Source:** Performance Report, 1999 *Frequency:* Annually *Next Update:* 2000 **Validation Procedure:** External evaluations of the civic and economic education programs are conducted annually. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Attempt to improve accuracy of data.
	Students		**Teachers**			
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998-99:	**58,000**	**No target set**	**2,100**	**No target set**		
1999-00:		65,000		2,500		
2000-01:		72,000		2,900		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies continued from 1999

- Disseminate information about exemplary curricula and teacher training programs.
- Provide technical assistance to the grantees on curriculum frameworks.
- To increase coordination, we will encourage grantees to share lessons about the development and implementation of the educational programs.
- Monitor program by conducting site visits of selected programs.
- Encourage grantees to collaborate on project activities in common sites in eligible countries.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Conduct an annual site visit of selected programs in eligible countries to observe effects of programs.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- This program is coordinated with and receives assistance from the Department of State.
- The "We The People" program is integral to the civic education curriculum materials used abroad.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Sufficient funds were not available to conduct annual site visits in eligible countries and to selected programs in the United States.
- Coordination of project activities (civic and economic education) in common sites in eligible countries.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From two years old Annual plan (FY 1999)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From last year's Annual Plan (FY 2000)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1, Student knowledge and skills, is now indicator 1.1.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.1, Curriculum and training programs, was dropped because it is a reflection of program activity, not outcomes.

New—None.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Goal: To ensure equal access to education for all students through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) is the principal office within ED that enforces Federal civil rights laws. OCR also supports ED Strategic Plan Goals 1, 2, and 3 by ensuring equal access to education to enable all students to achieve high standards. By definition, "all students" in the ED Strategic Plan means students from all backgrounds regardless of race, national origin, color, disability, age, or gender.

FY 2000—$71,200,000

FY 2001—$76,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATORY EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES WITHIN SCHOOLS.

Indicator 1.1 Increased compliance: The number of recipients of Federal funds (e.g., school districts, postsecondary institutions, and state educational agencies (SEAs), that change policies, procedures, or practices to comply with Federal civil rights laws will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1998	1,378	Baseline year
FY 1999:	**1,563**	**Increase over 1,378***
FY 2000		Increase over 1,563*
FY 2001		Increase over FY 2000*

* Meeting the targets is contingent on complaint workload and funding.

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target met.

Explanation: In FY 1998, 1,378 recipients—consisting of approximately 1,013 school districts, 22 SEAs (with 2,936 school districts), 233 postsecondary institutions, and two state systems of higher education—changed policies, practices, and procedures to comply with Federal civil rights law.

In FY 1999, 1,563 recipients—consisting of approximately 1,152 school districts, five SEAs (with 6,670 school districts), 403 postsecondary institutions, and two state systems of higher education (with 139 postsecondary institutions)—changed policies, practices, and procedures to comply with Federal civil rights laws.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Annual data from OCR's Case Information System, 1999.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: ED Data Quality Attestation Process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Indicators.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: *Limitations:* OCR chose to measure compliance at the point of case resolution rather than at the end of monitoring. In doing so, OCR recognizes that the extent of influence of the agreement to effect change is being measured, rather than the actual accomplished change. While this indicator places equal value on all recipients, it is important to note that changes to policies, procedures, and practices at the state or district-wide level have a more systemic impact than those made at a school-based level. *Planned Improvements:* Replace CIS with a more user friendly and less labor-intensive system. The system will have the capacity to link CIS data to specific case files, which will improve the validity of the data. In addition, OCR will move CIS to a platform that is compatible with the Department's information technology environment.

Indicator 1.2 Number of students affected: The estimated number of students positively affected by OCR's work will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target met.	**Source:** Annual data from OCR's Case Information System, 1999.
FY 1998:	5,900,000	Baseline year		*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 1999:	**6,571,725**	**Increase over 5,900,000***	**Explanation:** This indicator expands on the results of Indicator 1.1. It demonstrates the number of students positively affected by improved access to equal educational opportunity when recipients change policies, practices, and procedures to eliminate or prevent civil rights problems.	*Next Update:* 2000.
FY 2000:		Increase over 6,571,725*		**Validation Procedure:** ED Data Quality Attestation Process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Indicators.
FY 2001:		Increase over FY 2000*		
* Meeting the targets is contingent on complaint workload and funding.			OCR counts student impact at the point of case resolution rather than at the end of monitoring because case resolution is the point in case processing that provides the most reliable, available, and contemporaneous information for making meaningful program management decisions within the budget cycle. In doing so, OCR recognizes the extent of influence of the agreement to effect change is being measured, rather than the actual accomplished change. OCR is careful to count only the students who are expected to directly experience change through the implementation of a resolution agreement. In some instances, the numbers are small, such as the resolution of a gifted and talented case or one that involves only English-language learners. The resolution of a disability complaint often affects one student. Alternatively, the numbers can be large, such as with the resolution of a sexual harassment case that involves training all staff and students on the implementation of a new policy.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements**: *Limitations:* Student enrollment data used by OCR to calculate student impact is the most current data available to the recipient. *Planned Improvements:* Replace CIS with a user-friendlier and less labor-intensive system. The system will have the capacity to link CIS data to specific case files, which will improve the validity of the data. In addition, OCR will move CIS to a platform that is compatible with the Department's IT environment.

OBJECTIVE 2: TO TEACH PARENTS AND STUDENTS HOW TO RESOLVE PROBLEMS OF SECURING EQUAL ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATION.

Indicator 2.1 Successful partnerships: The number of partnerships with parents that lead to civil rights compliance will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Baseline established.	**Source:** Annual data from OCR's Case Information System, 1999.
FY 1999:	**18**	**Baseline year**	**Explanation:** A parental partnership is established when OCR's facilitates a collaboration between parents and schools to achieve ongoing civil rights compliance without OCR's continued involvement.	*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 2000:		Increase over 18*		*Next Update:* 2000.
FY 2001:		Increase over FY 2000*		**Validation Procedure:** ED Data Quality Attestation Process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Indicators.
* Meeting the targets is contingent on complaint workload and funding.				**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** *Limitations:* OCR's conservative approach to measuring parent partnerships generated by OCR's activities results in an undercount of potential benefits to students. We count a parent partnership only when we validate that a measurable result for students has occurred. *Planned Improvements:* Replace CIS with an user-friendlier and less labor-intensive system. The system will have the capacity to link CIS data to specific case files, which will improve the validity of the data. In addition, OCR will move CIS to a platform that is compatible with the Department's information technology environment.

OBJECTIVE 3: TO OBTAIN RESULTS BY THE EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES.

Indicator 3.1 Resolution of complaints: Eighty percent of the complaints are resolved within 180 days of receipt.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target met.	**Source:** Annual data from OCR's Case Information System and analysis of complaint workload, 1999.
1997	80%		**Explanation:** A key factor contributing to OCR's success in prompt complaint resolution is the ability to establish a target date for resolving each case on its own merit in an appropriate and timely way. Informed by experience in case resolution and given adequate funding, OCR determined that approximately 80 percent of its cases could be resolved in 180 days or less. Twenty percent of OCR's cases are so large in scope and complexity that the time needed to resolve these cases exceeds 180 days. These circumstances are not expected to change in the foreseeable future. Consequently, OCR does not anticipate changing its performance targets.	*Frequency:* Annually.
1998	81%			*Next Update:* 2000.
1999:	**80%**	**80%**		**Validation Procedure:** ED Data Quality Attestation Process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Indicators.
2000		80%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** *Planned Improvements:* Replace CIS with a more user friendly and less labor-intensive system. The system will have the capacity to link CIS data to specific case files, which will improve the validity of the data. In addition, OCR will move CIS to a platform that is compatible with the Department's information technology environment.
2001		80%		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- To manage an increasing workload and address complex civil rights issues, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) continues to move from a reactive complaint-driven system to implement a balanced enforcement program by responding promptly to complaints and initiating activities that target resources for maximum impact. A Government Accounting Office (GAO) study dated February 23, 1999, acknowledged significant improvements in OCR's operations between FY 1993 and FY 1997 in the time to process complaints, the number of complaints processed annually, and the average backlog of unprocessed complaints at year end. The GAO concluded: "OCR has improved its complaint resolution process in two major ways, replacing a process that focused on investigating complaints with a more flexible system that focuses on resolving complaints as soon as possible ... allow[ing] complaints to be resolved at any point in the process [and improving performance] by undertak[ing] several information and communication efforts."
- To expand customer service, OCR provides civil-rights-related information, technical expertise, and assistance to a broad range of stakeholders engaged in collaborative efforts to ensure equal educational opportunity.
- To ensure that investigative strategies and resolution approaches are well informed, OCR develops case resolution agreements that provide for the active participation of parents and students.
- To maintain a technically proficient and highly trained staff, OCR uses performance measures, human resource development, and technology to promote efficiency.
- Numerical benchmarks and performance indicators provide one body of quantifiable information relevant to the assessment of OCR's work. There are many other facets to the evaluation of OCR's work that are not readily quantifiable, such as the professionalism and responsiveness of OCR staff.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- **Tools to Facilitate Positive Change by Stakeholders:** (1) OCR partnered with the National Association of Attorneys General to publish a guide for schools, Protecting Students from Harassment and Hate Crime. The guide was posted on the ED Internet Web site and disseminated to over 20,000 school superintendents and state attorneys general; (2) OCR collaborated with a state educational Agency and a state interscholastic athletic agency to develop a Web site to enable school districts throughout the state to conduct self-evaluations of their athletic programs. This Web site was added to a prominent athletic equity site on the Web increasing the availability of the self-evaluation tools OCR assisted in developing.
- **Strategies for Statewide Collaborations to Achieve Positive Educational Results:** (1) OCR worked collaboratively with statewide higher education systems that may have vestiges of *de jure* segregation to take action to ensure access to postsecondary education and to enhance facilities and programs of Historically Black Colleges and Universities; (2) OCR established statewide resolutions on important access issues including services to English-language learners and access to gifted and talented programs.
- **Sound Educational Results and Customer Service:** (1) OCR has begun a project to evaluate to what degree OCR agreements in designated issues, such as services to English-language learners, are producing good educational results. As OCR identifies practices that are working well for districts, it will share them with other recipients; (2) An OCR project evaluating the effectiveness of resolution agreements in minorities and special education cases disclosed additional educationally effective strategies that can be used in future cases; (3) OCR established a new strategy for monitoring, with additional attention paid to active and frequent engagement with recipients and other stakeholders, to ensure that OCR's agreements were effective in achieving change.
- **Educational Reform and Equity:** OCR has helped lead Departmental efforts to ensure that issues of equity are appropriately addressed in the context of elementary and secondary standards-based reforms. OCR's work with external stakeholders in this area is illustrated by (1) OCR's ongoing work with the National Academy of Sciences Board on Testing and Assessment; (2) OCR's primary oversight responsibility for Board on Testing Assessment's Forum on Educational Excellence and Testing Equity (designed to provide useful forums and resources to educational and policy stakeholders regarding educational testing issues); and (3) OCR's promulgation of a resource guide for educators and policymakers that comprehensively addresses testing and nondiscrimination issues.
- **Staff Development to Build Capacity:** OCR is building staff capacity to use methods that emphasize listening to educators and educational experts, collaborating with recipients to resolve civil rights issues, linking stakeholders with similar interests, providing legally sufficient models for civil rights compliance that are educationally sound, and providing students and parents with information about their civil rights.
- **Technology:** OCR chartered a Technology Advisory Board to coordinate enterprise-wide planning on technology to ensure that technology funding decisions are integrally related to program objectives. Projects under way include the Internet redesign, the creation of an intranet community of practice, development of a Case Management information system, and an integrated data collection system. The focus of Internet redesign is to better meet the information resource needs of students, parents, recipients, and other stakeholders.

How This Program Coordinates With Other Federal Activities

- Civil rights information in postsecondary education is acquired through a cooperative agreement with the National Center for Education Statistics in its Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. A pilot project between OCR and the Office of Special Education Programs will test the feasibility of collecting data related to students with disabilities into a single, consolidated data collection instrument.
- OCR works with the Department of Justice, Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and other Federal agencies to ensure consistency, as appropriate, in legal interpretations on issues of common interest. OCR and other ED components (Office of the General Counsel, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Bilingual and Minority Languages Affairs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Postsecondary Education Programs, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, etc.) work together on issues of educational equity and program reauthorization activities. Where appropriate, OESE and OSERS issue policy guidance jointly with OCR in overlapping areas. Working closely with other Departmental components on issues of common interest ensures that OCR uses resources effectively.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- Expanding customer service for recipients by using case models that align principles of educational equity with high standards goals.
- Maintaining a staff proficient in the use of technology.
- Managing an increasing workload and addressing civil rights issues that raise increasingly complex educational issues in the context of limited FTE and financial resources.
- Ensuring that investigative strategies and resolution approaches are well informed and support educational excellence.

Indicator Changes

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- FY 1999 Indicator 2.1 was modified to focus specifically on partnerships with parents.

Dropped

- FY 1999 Indicator 1.1, Access to quality education, was dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New

- For FY 1999, the descriptions of Objectives 1 and 2 were modified to more specifically reflect OCR's critical programmatic performance goals.
- For FY 1999, Objective 3 was added to measure management efficiencies that have significant impact on results.
- For FY 1999, the data sources for Indicators 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 were further clarified.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL (OIG)

Goal: To promote the efficient and effective use of taxpayer dollars in support of American education by providing independent and objective assistance to the Congress and the Secretary of Education in assuring continuous improvement in program delivery, effectiveness, and integrity.

FY 2001—$36,500,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: OIG PRODUCTS AND SERVICES ARE USED BY THE DEPARTMENT, CONGRESS, AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY, EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEGRITY OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND OPERATIONS.

Indicator 1.1 The number and percentage of significant recommendations accepted and implemented will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Recommendations accepted

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1998:	50 (67%)	
FY 1999:	**70 (71%)**	**Continuing increase**
FY 2000:		Continuing increase
FY 2001:		Continuing increase

Recommendations implemented

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
FY 1998:	25 (13%)	
FY 1999:	**62 (37%)**	**Continuing increase**
FY 2000:		Continuing increase
FY 2001:		Continuing increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Performance improved from FY 98. Continued improvement is likely because of increased emphasis on resolution and follow up and on timing; some corrective actions take time to fully implement where legislative, regulatory, or system changes are required. Recommendations related to reports issued in prior fiscal years and for which corrective action was initiated may now just be at the completion stage.

Explanation: The percentage is calculated by adding up the total number of significant recommendations that have been resolved for the fiscal year and dividing that number into the total number of significant recommendations that had been accepted for the fiscal year. This indicator uses only recommendations from audit work. This information is only for jobs that are related to Objective 1.

Significant monetary recommendation is defined as to recovering monetary amounts of questions, unsupported, or other dollars of $300,000 or more. It also includes the associated recommendation to establish/implement control techniques to prevent recurrence of the condition that gives to the monetary finding or better use of funds of $500,000 or more.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: OIG audit files that are provided to our office by the regions. A spreadsheet was prepared with the data that were used in determining this information.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: FY 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data verified using ED's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The measure includes only recommendations from audit reports. Significant recommendations from other OIG services, such as quick response projects and consulting, are not included in this measure. The classification of OIG work as "Improvement" or "Integrity" is somewhat subjective. Some work relates to both areas.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Significant nonmonetary recommendation is a recommendation to establish/implement procedures or control techniques to (1) improve the effective or efficient delivery of program services; (2) safeguard assets or prevent fraud, waste, or abuse; or (3) improve the integrity, accuracy, and completeness of management data involving a program, or a significant component of any program, funded at $500,000 or more annually.	

Indicator 1.2 Customers will be satisfied with OIG products and services.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to determine.	**Source:** Information will come from the party audited.
FY 1999:	**Not available**	**No target set**		***Frequency***: Annually.
FY 2000:		To be collected	**Explanation:** New indicator.	***Next Update***: FY 2000.
FY 2001:		To be determined based on analysis of baseline data		**Validation Procedure:** To be established.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: In the past, an audit questionnaire was included with OIG audits. The response was poor. To obtain better responses, we have worked with the Office of Chief Information Officer to develop an email survey. The success will depend upon the cooperation of those audited.

Indicator 1.3 Resources (as measured by the percentage of staff time) will be deployed in accordance with the Work Plan.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No significant change in performance from FY 98 to FY 99.	**Source:** Time and Travel Reporting System.
FY 1998:	48%			***Frequency***: Annually.
FY 1999:	**46%**	**Continuing increase**		***Next Update***: FY 2000.
FY 2000:		Continuing increase	**Explanation:** This number was calculated by taking the total number of staff hours that the office charged to jobs in the Work Plan and dividing it by the hours that were spent on Goal 1.	**Validation Procedure:** Data verified using ED's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
			The OIG Work Plan baseline is at the start of the fiscal year, October 1. The actual performance achieved will never reach 100 percent because the Work Plan covers a two-year period, and new jobs are identified that take precedence for reasons such as risk or need for immediate completion.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Based on self-reported data generated by ED staff.

Indicator 1.4 The number, percentage, or both, of Work Plan assignments initiated will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No significant change in performance from FY 98 to FY 99.	**Source:** OIG report on Work Plan Project Status Sheets. All work is listed in Work Plan Project Status Sheets by audit project number.
FY 1998:	61%			
FY 1999:	**62%**	**Continuing increase**		
FY 2000:		Continuing increase	**Explanation:** This indicator measures the degree to which OIG work done during the fiscal year related to Objective 1 (Improvement of programs and operations) is work identified in the annually updated OIG Work Plan. Annually, the OIG prepares a Work Plan that contains projects deemed to be the most important. The denominator of the percentage is the number of projects from a prior Work Plan plus any additions to the current Work Plan. The numerator is the number of audit projects started. This indicator includes those projects where the objectives were intended to improve programs or operations. This information reflects only jobs that are coded as Objective 1.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000.
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure**: Data verified using ED's Standard for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
			The OIG Work Plan baseline is at the start of the fiscal year, October 1. The actual performance achieved will never reach 100 percent because the Work Plan covers a 2-year period, and new jobs are identified which take precedence for reasons such as risk or need for immediate completion.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The calculation is of projects not resources. The calculation does not indicate the degree to which OIG resources are devoted to projects included in the OIG Work Plan.

OBJECTIVE 2: OIG'S WORK DISCLOSES SIGNIFICANT FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE; RESULTS IN ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS; AND PROMOTES DETERRENCE. WORK DISCLOSES SIGNIFICANT FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE AND RESULTS IN ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS OR OTHER SIGNIFICANT CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS MEASURED BY THE FOLLOWING INDICATORS.

Indicator 2.1 The number and percentage of cases presented for enforcement actions that are accepted by enforcement officials will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Performance improved from FY 98.	**Source:** Agents are required to report in a timely manner instances in which investigative cases are presented to, and accepted or declined for action by, enforcement officials.
FY 1998:	79 (69%)			
FY 1999:	**82 (80%)**	**Continuing increase**	**Explanation:** The OIG receives and reviews allegations of fraudulent conduct involving funds disbursed through the Department's programs and of misconduct by Department employees and contractors. Preliminary investigative activity determines which allegations have merit, and formal criminal, civil, and administrative investigations are initiated.	*Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000.
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data verified using ED's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	In FY 99, the civil prosecutions of the clients of two financial aid consultants primarily accounted for the increase in their percentage of cases accepted for enforcement action. The percentage is calculated as the total number of cases accepted for an enforcement action divided by the number of cases presented to enforcement officials during the year.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The supervisors and desk officers need to ensure that agents are reporting these items in an appropriate and timely fashion. Review of ICTS data as part the 90-day case review process includes reviewing the timely and accurate reporting of data.

Indicator 2.2 The number and percentage of presented cases resulting in enforcement actions (e.g., indictments, civil filings, convictions, adverse personnel actions, suspensions and debarments) will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Performance improved from FY 98.	**Source:** Enforcement actions are initiated by sources outside the OIG. Therefore, the OIG relies on action and documentation from officials from the Department of Justice and the Department of Education. When enforcement actions occur, agents are required to report the items in the ICTS in a timely manner. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000.
FY 1998:	33 (29%)			
FY 1999:	**50 (49%)**	**Continuing increase**	**Explanation:** In FY 99, the civil prosecution of the clients of two financial aid consultants primarily accounted for the increase in the percentage of accepted cases resulting in enforcement actions.	
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase	Many investigations by the OIG result in prosecutorial activity (indictments, information, pre-trial diversions, and convictions), civil proceedings, personnel actions, and suspension and debarments. The percentage is calculated as the total number of enforcement actions divided by the number of cases presented for enforcement action in each fiscal year.	**Validation Procedure:** Data verified using ED's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Agents, supervisors, and desk officers must ensure that these data are inputted in the ICTS system in a timely and accurate manner. Review of ICTS data as part the 90-day case review process adds to the timely and accurate reporting of data.

Indicator 2.3 The amount of monetary penalties, settlements, and recoveries will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Performance decreased from FY 98.	**Source:** Semiannual Report to Congress (Audit Tracking System, Investigative Tracking System, Common Audit Resolution System, and Department of Justice). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000.
FY 1998:	$67 million			
FY 1999:	**$24 million**	**Continuing increase**	**Explanation:** Overall, a decrease of $44 million occurred from 1998 to 1999. A significant portion of the decline can be attributed to the 1998 conclusion of a lengthy investigation that resulted in a $28 million civil settlement and a $2 million fine. Given the nature of our investigative work, this indicator must be used judiciously and in conjunction with other indicators. Criminal prosecution is not undertaken primarily to recover money.	
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data verified using ED's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Enforcement actions that result in a conviction or civil settlements/judgments typically include court-ordered restitution and fines, and the payment of civil penalties. Additionally, OIG audits result in sustained questioned costs and sustained unsupported costs. These monetary figures are compiled into a grand total to determine a financial assessment of enforcement and corrective actions initiated by OIG work.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Agents, auditors, supervisors, and desk officers must ensure that these data are inputted in the ICTS and ATS systems in a timely and accurate manner. Review of ICTS data as part of the 90-day case review process adds to the timely and accurate reporting of data.

Indicator 2.4 The number and percentage of significant recommendations in compliance audits accepted.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Compliance audits accepted			**Status:** Performance improved from FY 98. Increase is likely because of increased emphasis on resolution and followup and because of timing: that is, some corrective actions take time to be fully implemented when legislative, regulatory, or system changes are required. Recommendations related to reports issued in prior fiscal years and for which corrective action was initiated may now just be at the completion stage. **Explanation:** Definitions of significant monetary and nonmonetary recommendations and calculation of percentages are the same as in Indicator 1.1 above. This information is only for jobs related to Goal 2.	**Source:** OIG audit files that are provided to our office by the regions and by the Department. A spreadsheet was prepared with the data that were used in determining this information. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data verified using ED's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The measure includes only recommendations from audit products. Significant recommendations from other OIG services, such as quick response projects and consulting, are not included in this measure. The classification of OIG work as Improvement or Integrity is somewhat subjective. Some work relates to both areas.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
FY 1998:	21 (75%)			
FY 1999:	**10 (77%)**	**Continuing increase**		
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		
Compliance audits implemented				
FY 1998:	8 (6%)			
FY 1999:	**16 (13%)**	**Continuing increase**		
FY 2000:		Continuing increase		
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		

Indicator 2.5 The amount of dollar recoveries sustained versus recommended in Federal audits.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Performance decreased from FY 98.	**Source:** OIG Audit Tracking System.
	Sustained	Recommended			*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 1998:	$16,601,814	$24,0245,845		**Explanation:** The amount of recoveries recommended in our audit reports is based on information available and/or provided by the party audited at the time the audit was conducted. Subsequent to issuance of the audit report and during the resolution phase of the audit report, the party audited may provide information not made available to the auditors that indicates the expenditure of Federal funds was within the scope of the program and that therefore recovery is not warranted.	*Next Update:* FY 2000.
FY 1999:	**$4,148,668**	**$8,775,514**	**Continuing increase**		
FY 2000:			Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data verified using ED's Standards For Evaluating Program Performance Data.
FY 2001:			Continuing increase		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The measure includes only OIG audit products that contained dollar recoveries.
				This indicator measures OIG's sustainment rate. The dollars recommended for recovery in audits that were resolved during the fiscal year are compared with the dollars that the Department agreed should be recovered. The dollars recommended for recovery includes question costs, unsupported costs, and other recommended recoveries. Dollars recommended for recovery does not include better use of funds (BUF).	

Indicator 2.6 The degree to which resources (percentage of staff time) were deployed in accordance with the Work Plan.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No significant change in performance from FY 98 to FY 99.	**Source:** OIG Time and Travel Reporting System
FY 1998:	52%			*Frequency:* Annually.
FY 1999:	54%	**Continuing increase**		*Next Update:* FY 2000.
FY 2000:		Continuing increase	**Explanation:** The OIG Work Plan baseline is at the start of the fiscal year, October 1. The actual performance achieved will never reach 100 percent because the Work Plan covers a 2-year period and new jobs are identified that take precedence for reasons such as risk or need for immediate completion. This number was calculated by taking the total number of staff hours that the office charged to jobs in the Work Plan and dividing it by the hours that were worked on for Goal 2.	
FY 2001:		Continuing increase		**Validation Procedure:** Data verified using ED's Standards For Evaluating Program Performance Data.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Based on self-reported data generated by ED staff.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- The OIG Strategic Plan was initially written in 1994 and revised in 1997. The strategies, as revised in 1997, are those that are currently being utilizing.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- The OIG has an annual Work Plan that covers FYs 2000-2001. This plan is updated annually and is the means of operationalizing the Strategic Plan. Copies of the plan are available at the OIG Web site: www.ed.gov/Offices/OIG
- This year the OIG will be reviewing its Strategic Plan. This review will include all of its goals, strategies, and performance measures.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- The OIG conducts joint investigations with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Postal Service, and other Federal investigative agencies.
- The OIG is an active participant with other Offices of Inspectors General in the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

None.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.6. Surveys of Customer Satisfaction with OIG Priorities.
- Indicator 2.8. Surveys of Customer Satisfaction with OIG Products and Services.
- Indicator 2.9. Surveys of Customer Satisfaction with OIG Priorities.
- Indicator 2.7. Amount of Dollar Recoveries Sustained Versus Recommended in Non-Federal audits. OIG no longer issues non-Federal audits.

New—None.